This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 08164029 8

NEW YORK CITY LIBRARY

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Contents.

1. The Doctrine of Scripture Concerning Baptism.

2. The Character & Spread of Spiritualism

3. "Appointments of God in Judgment & Mercy"

4. Erroneous Statements Concerning Atonements & its Results. No III

5. do do Part 3rd No V

6. An Effect of the Doctrines Animadverted on in preceding Tracts

ANNEX

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE

RESPECTING

BAPTISM

BRIEFLY CONSIDERED,

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

EV. 10

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,

12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.1.

PHONE—CITY 4480.

1907.

Price, 1s. 9d. Nett.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
345269A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1927 L

F. W. SARGENT,

PRINTER,

HIGH STREET, RYDE.

Digitized by Google

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE volume now issued to the public is, with one slight exception (of which the Author left a written emendation) and corrections of various press errors, a reprint, word for word, of the original work published in two parts, the first of which has been out of print for some years. It has been thought advisable to collect all the Appendices together and to re-letter them consecutively, notice of which is given in the Contents. An Index of Subjects, and another of Scripture Texts, will be found at the end of the volume.

The Greek Text followed is that of Dr. Tregelles from the most ancient authorities.

April, 1907.

27X467

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

		PAGE.
PART I.	.. ..	1
PART II.	.. ..	33
APPENDIX A, originally to Part I.	ON THE LAVER	66
APPENDIX B, ,, ,,	ON THE WORD SACRAMENT	74
APPENDIX C, ,, ,,	ON 1 PETER III. 20 ..	82
APPENDIX D, ,, ,,	EXTRACT FROM O'BRIEN..	87
APPENDIX E, ,, ,,	1 CORINTHIANS XV. 29 ..	91
APPENDIX F, originally A to Part II.	ON THE MEANING OF ΒΑΠΤΙΖΩ	94
APPENDIX G, ,, B ,,	AUGUSTINE'S REPLY TO BONIFACE	101
APPENDIX H, ,, C ,,	ON FABER'S "PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION"	121
APPENDIX J, ,, D ,,	ON THE SEAL OF THE HOLY SPIRIT	126
APPENDIX K, ,, E ,,	ON CORRUPT PRACTICES INTRODUCED INTO THE EARLY CHURCH, AND THOSE OBSERVED BY THE CHURCH OF ROME	134
INDEX OF SUBJECTS ..	.. ..	148
INDEX OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS	.. ..	150

Digitized by Google

Baptism, Briefly Considered.

I.

It would be a happy thing, if, in questions of Christian Truth, we could confine ourselves to a consideration of the form in which it is first presented to us by God, without reference to its corruption by man. But this is impossible now. The darkness which has so long brooded over Christendom, has not been without its result. Not only has the light of Truth been shrouded, but Satan has also kindled many a false light whereby he too successfully deceives. If we did not know the power of the great Enemy and the deceivableness of the human heart, we might marvel at the facility with which he hides or perverts the truths that are most clearly and most fully revealed. The truths most important for us to know, and which, therefore, God has with most simplicity revealed, are those against which Satan seems to have directed his chiefest power. And his attempts have been permitted to prosper.

Digitized by Google

What for example is more plainly revealed in Scripture, than that Justifying Faith is, Reliance on God as effecting for us through Christ what we have no power to effect for ourselves. Justifying Faith, said the Reformers, is "reliance on the divine mercy remitting sin for Christ's sake." [Fiducia divinæ misericordiæ peccata remittentis propter Christum.] No definition can be more simple; none more exact. It does not say that justifying faith is an act of the understanding *merely;* it defines it to be a reliance of the heart on God as having Himself provided the reconciliation. Yet this definition, so simple and so true, Rome, followed by the greater part of Christendom, not only rejects but pronounces accursed. "If any one shall say that justifying faith is nothing else than reliance on the divine mercy remitting sin for Christ's sake, let him be accursed." (Canons of Council of Trent, Sess. 6, Can. 12.) Such is the curse which infallible Rome has pronounced upon God's holy Truth. Her teachers teach that faith has nothing moral in its nature; that it is not a reliance of the soul, but a mere assent of the understanding—such assent as we render to well authenticated facts.* After thus defining faith Rome may

* Bellarmine says that their divines "fidem historicam et miraculorum et promissionum unam et eandem esse docent; atque illam unam non esse proprie notitiam aut fiduciam *sed assensum certum atque firmissimum ob auctoritatem primæ veritatis*, et hanc unam esse fidem justificantem." (De Just. I, cap. 4.) For further remarks on this subject see Appendix D.

Digitized by Google

well ask triumphantly whether sinners can be justified before God by faith only: for it is very obvious that devils may have such faith as this and tremble. To believe a fact, and to believe on a Person whose promises are faithfulness and truth, are things very diverse. But alas! Rome is not the alone corrupter of this precious Truth. We find even Protestant teachers saying that "Faith is not to be regarded as a separate and simple virtue, but that it denotes all the conditions of the Gospel covenant, that is, it includes within itself all the works of Christian piety." *(Bishop Bull.)* And Bishop Burnet says, that "Faith, in the New Testament, stands generally for the complex of Christianity": and that "as including our hope, our love, our repentance, and our obedience, faith is the condition that makes us capable of receiving redemption and free grace." According to this, faith, as being something that includes within itself every moral excellency, justifies by its own intrinsic meritoriousness, and not as the link which connects with the meritoriousness of another. A sinner brings to God hope, love, repentance, obedience—in a word, every excellency—and, on the ground of having these excellencies, receives free grace! Such has been the teaching of Protestants in England. Rome herself has not more audaciously dared to make faith void, and the promise in Christ of none effect.

In human life men find no difficulty in understanding what RELIANCE means. Suppose that

Digitized by Google

on a dark and stormy night, pursued by a relentless foe, we find our flight suddenly arrested by some mighty stream, and we despair—but suddenly we hear the voice of a well-known friend telling us that his care had provided for our need, and bidding us follow, leaning on his arm. We obey: we rely upon that care: we lean upon that arm. It conducts us to a fitly-ordered bark, and we cross in safety the raging flood. Do we find it hard in such a case to define to ourselves the nature of the reliance by which, instrumentally, we are saved? We do not say that it is a mere act of the understanding. We do not call it meritorious. We do not call it a work; for we know that we have not worked—that we have not bridged for ourselves the mighty waters. We know that we are wholly indebted to the love, forethought, and power of another. We do not speak of our gratitude or anything else that we may subsequently feel, or acknowledge, or do, as being the cause of our friend's free and spontaneous love. We should deem it a sin as well as an absurdity, to speak of our gratitude as giving a character or value to our reliance, when we know that fear and the consciousness of present danger, and the knowledge of our friend's power and kindness, were the motives which caused us to rely without respect to anything else whether present or to come. Men easily recognise all this in their own natural sphere, but they refuse to recognise it in the things of God.

If then the primary doctrine of the Gospel—

Digitized by Google

Justification by faith—has been systematically perverted, we cannot wonder that Baptism, the primary ordinance of Christianity, should have been perverted likewise. The doctrines and the ordinances of the New Covenant stand or fall together. Before we turn, however, to the painful subject of their perversion, let us first consider in what aspect Baptism is presented to us in Scripture.

Baptism, like the Lord's Supper, is an ordinance attached to the *New* Covenant, which is a Covenant not of works but of PROMISE and GRACE. The first, or Sinai-covenant, was not of *grace*. In *it* (in order that the radical disobedience of man's heart might be to man demonstrated) God covenanted to grant the award of LIFE with all its accompanying blessings, if Israel on their part would render complete obedience to Him—if, to adopt the words of the English Baptismal service, they would "obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same ALL the days of their life." This, Israel in their folly, stipulated. But when the utter failure of this covenant had been proved, when every stipulation had been broken and every promise violated, then God introduced another Covenant, in which all that is needful to bring unto glory is undertaken by God. Is a sacrifice needed of everlasting efficacy to purge away for ever the guilt of sin? Christ is that sacrifice. Is faith needed in order to connect us with Jesus? Faith is the gift of God. Are good works necessary

www.Cgal

as consequents and evidences of faith? Believers are "His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God afore prepared (*προητοίμασεν*) that we should walk in them." "I will write my laws upon their heart that they shall not depart from me." "Their sins and iniquities *I* will remember no more. I WILL BE their God, they SHALL BE my people." All these words are authoritative. The promises are absolute, attended by no conditions except such as God has undertaken to secure. In this Covenant the place of stipulation and bestowment is occupied by God: that of recipiency and acknowledgment by ourselves. Baptism, therefore, as being connected with such a Covenant, is necessarily an ordinance of GRACE. In it we present ourselves not as stipulators, but as recipients: not as basing our hopes on *our* future obedience to God, but as heirs of the blessings due to the obedience of our heavenly Surety. At Sinai man presented himself as a stipulator, and he perished: at *Z*ion, the mountain of grace, the believer stands in the place of humble recipiency, and he lives.

Nothing, perhaps, shows more clearly how peculiarly Baptism is an ordinance of GRACE than the period in the life of faith that is appointed for its administration. When we consider the extent and greatness of the blessings of which Baptism is the sign, we may be disposed to ask whether its administration should not be delayed until increased

Digitized by Google

experience and knowledge enable us in a measure to appreciate its meaning. But God has appointed otherwise. It is not an ordinance reserved for the advanced and experienced in the school of Christ. It meets us in the infancy of our faith and knowledge. It meets us where the Cross finds us. Therefore, although Baptism is the sign and the pledge of blessings that will not be developed fully till we are conformed to the image of Christ in glory, yet, the babe in faith receives the seal of their being his, in token that they are inherited entirely on the title of the name of Another.

The narrative of the conversion of the Eunuch in the eighth chapter of the Acts sufficiently proves that as soon as we have received the gospel and confessed the name of Jesus, we have instantly a title to be baptized. The Eunuch was reading respecting Him who "was led as a lamb to the slaughter." He read, but he understood not until Philip came and preached unto him Jesus; then his eyes were opened. He recognised the substitutional sufferings of Jesus as the object proposed to him by God, that he might look thereto and live. He turned in faith to Jesus, and from that moment he stood before God no longer in his own individuality, but as associated with the perfectness of Another. And although as yet he might imperfectly estimate the extent of his blessings, yet he was known by God as covered by all the preciousness of the name of Jesus. He desired to be baptized

Digitized by Google

in that name, and his request was granted. He was not commanded to wait until his faith was more developed, or his knowledge enlarged. God's promises in Christ pertained to him, not because he had a certain quality of faith; nor because of any future results that might be expected from that faith; but simply because he *had* faith; whether weak or whether strong was not the question. "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." *

The aspect in which we are wont to regard Baptism when first we believe, is as the appointed

* I omit the intervening verse, viz., "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart," &c., because it is universally admitted that the whole of this verse is an interpolation. Nor would the Scripture so speak. If such words were found in the Scripture, weak believers might long torment themselves with the question, whether they believed *with all their heart*. The Scripture is very careful never to represent justifying faith as any thing else than simple reliance. Such reliance may be, or may not be firm; and the results that flow from it may vary. But our acceptance is not affected thereby, because God has not connected acceptance with reliance of a certain degree or quality, but with reliance as such. Some have sought to alter God's definition of justifying faith, and have said that no faith is justifying except that which so consciously appropriates the promises in Christ, as to be attended with present peace and joy. This is to confound the results of faith with faith. The promises of God are to him that believeth, and are not limited to those who have conscious peace in believing, although it is true that conscious peace should be the result.

Digitized by Google

ordinance in which we confess the name of Jesus, and show forth the remission of sins through Him received, and also as the ordinance by which we are formally and visibly introduced into that body which as baptized in the name of Jesus, stands, or should stand, as His confessing people in the midst of a gainsaying world. These aspects of Baptism are indeed of great moment; but we must beware of making them exclusive aspects. Baptism is not merely an act of confession on our part, or a rite by which we visibly enter the communion of God's people; it is also on the part of God towards us His seal and sign of a work which His grace has effectually accomplished for us in the death and resurrection of His Son.

The work which God has accomplished for us in Christ extends far beyond the forgiveness of our sins. It is indeed true that in Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of God's grace. But Christ *by His death* has not only liberated us from the consequences of our sins, He has also liberated us from our sinful selves. Christ in becoming the sin-bearer for His people became their Representative. As such He entered those clouds of wrath which burst upon Him on the Cross: as such He entered those clouds of glory which awaited his ascension into the heavens. When, therefore, our Representative placed Himself beneath the power of death and died, we judicially died. Judicially, though not

Digitized by Google

actually, our existence as the fallen and corrupt children of the first Adam terminated then. In that sabbath, during which Jesus rested in the grave, we see a sabbath of rest for all the people of God, for they there found the rest of deliverance *from themselves* as well as from their sins. "If," says the Apostle in a passage not sufficiently meditated on, "if one died on behalf of all, then DID THE WHOLE DIE" (2 Cor. v. 14) *—that is, if Christ died substitutionally on behalf of all His believing people, then did the whole of that people die. The moment, therefore, any have Christ as their substitute, they are regarded in the courts of heaven as having received the award due to their sins, and also as separated judicially from their natural selves. This was the truth expressed by the Apostle when he said, "I HAVE BEEN crucified (co-crucified) with Christ." (*Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι.* Gal. ii. 20.) The word "I," indicated to the Apostle all that he characteristically was as a fallen child of the first Adam, and so regarded, he met judicial death on the Cross of his substitute. Again, he says, "our old man" (another name for our natural selves) WAS crucified with Him." (*συνεσταυρώθη.* Rom. vi. 6.) So also in Colossians iii. 3, "Ye are dead," or more literally, YE DIED (*ἀπεθάνετε*)—that is, when Christ, your Representative, died in your stead. On this ground also we are said to be cir-

* Ὅτι ΕΙΣ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον.

Digitized by Google

cumcised—that is, separated from the flesh by antitypical circumcision received in Christ.* He who is viewed as one with Christ in His death and resurrection cannot but be effectually separated from every thing beneath the heavens.

The recognition of this truth is of infinite importance in our present conflicts. Our great present sorrow is ourselves. Daily and hourly we feel the necessity of struggling against our "old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." Indeed, in it is hidden the seed and principle of every evil that has ever been manifested beneath the sun. Often in struggling with its corruption, we become so absorbed in the present circumstances of the conflict, as to forget what was effected for us at the Cross in respect of the old man and all its evil. We may, however, be sure of this, that in proportion as we fail in apprehending the nature of the victory achieved for us at the Cross, gloom is likely to overspread, and disaster to attend our best efforts. But when we see that we are struggling with a foe

* The words in Colossians ii. are as follows: "In whom (*i.e.*, Christ) ye were also circumcised by a circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision received [or accomplished] in Christ." The words, τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, are a Hebraism—the two last words being adjectival—"Christ-circumcision," *i.e.*, circumcision effected for us in Christ, in virtue of our having passed through death into resurrection-life in Him. Circumcision therefore and baptism both signify separation from the flesh; but baptism signifies also the *means*, viz., union with Christ in His death and resurrection. Circumcision typifies only the end,

Digitized by Google

already conquered; that our old man *has been* co-crucified with Christ; that we ourselves have judicially died; that in the estimate of Heaven we have left behind us in the grave of Christ all the accompaniments and characteristics of our earthly fallen being, then we find in these truths that which is as wine to the fainting lip—light to our eyes—marrow to our bones. We thank God that we have been not merely freed from our guilt, but that we have been also cleansed from ourselves. We wage the conflict with renewed courage, and find how the Spirit who comes to glorify Jesus owns and uses every remembrance of Him.

Nor do the Scriptures speak only of our having died in Christ. They teach us also that in Him as a new Covenant-Head—the Second man—the Last Adam, we have representatively been raised into glory. In the sixth of Romans it is said that "we are alive unto God IN Christ Jesus our Lord (*ζῶντας τῷ Θεῷ* EN *Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῳ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.*) In the Colossians we read, "Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God." (Col. iii. 3.) And again in the same chapter we are addressed as those who have been "co-raised with Christ." (*εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ.*) Again, in the second chapter of the Ephesians, "God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, co-quickened us with Christ . . . and co-raised and co-seated us with Him in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." (*συνεζωοποίησεν*

τῷ Χριστῷ . . . καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.) If the first Adam by his one downward step from Paradise, brought us into this world of sorrow and sin and ruin, so certainly has Christ, the second and last Adam, by His one upward step from death into glory, borne with Him all who are in Him—that is, all His believing people. Personally, we are on earth: representatively, we are above.

We might expect that it would be the desire of God to make this wondrous act of His grace very prominent before the hearts and consciences of His people. Accordingly, the first ordinance appointed to us as soon as we have believed, signifies to us this mercy. Baptism is, on the part of God, a SIGN to us that He has caused us to go down into death as into deep waters, and that He has also raised us up again out of those waters into new circumstances, where death and judgment have no longer any title against us. It signifies to us that we have died and been raised in ANOTHER. "Buried with him" (*i.e.*, with Christ) "in baptism, wherein also ye were raised with him (συνηγέρθητε) through faith in the operation of God who raised him from the dead." (Col. ii. 12.) *

* These words, "BURIED WITH HIM IN BAPTISM," sufficiently show, that in order to preserve the figure on which the typical significancy of Baptism altogether depends, it is necessary that the baptized person should be placed under the waters, as if therein *buried*. Indeed, few dispute that immersion was the original form in which Baptism was administered. Even the Church of

Digitized by Google

We cannot wonder that WATER [into which we descend as into a grave, for it is said, "buried with him" (*i.e.*, with Christ) "in baptism": and again, "planted with him in the likeness of his death" (see Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5, and Col. ii. 12)]: we cannot wonder that water should be used in Baptism to denote the power of death and of wrath. If we had beheld that vast abyss of waters of which we read in Genesis, where there was no light nor any life, where all was silence and darkness, we should instinctively have felt that such waters were a fitting symbol of death. Yet out of those dark waters, when the power of God acted thereon, this fair creation was brought—born as out of the womb of death. So early did God indicate His design of causing life, order, and gladness, to spring out of the intensity of the power of darkness and death.

Rome says, "The Pastor will briefly inform the faithful, that according to the common practice of the Church, baptism may be administered by immersion, infusion, or aspersion. . . . *Immersion was for a considerable time the practice in the early ages of the Church.* . . . The faithful will follow the practice of the particular Church to which they belong." *Catechism of the Council of Trent.* Part II. The Rubric of the Church of England also directs that if the Priest be certified that the child may well endure it, "*he shall dip it into the water* discreetly and warily"—otherwise, "it shall suffice to pour water on it." Archbishop Secker says, "Burying, as it were, the person baptized in water and raising him up out of it again, without question was antiently the more usual method." *Lectures on Catech. xxxv.* It is very evident that sprinkling cannot supply the type of *burial with Christ*; and we may be very sure it would never have been adopted, unless the true signification of Baptism as pointing to our death and resurrection in Christ as our Representative and Head, had not first been lost.

Digitized by Google

Again, at the Flood—if we had lived at the hour when the fountains of the great deep were broken up and the windows of the firmament opened; if we had beheld the mighty floods advancing on every side to destroy all life, and had seen creation overwhelmed, and heard the agonising cry of those who were swept into destruction: we should surely have recognised in those waters the expression, and the power, of wrath and of death. At the Red Sea also, when Pharaoh and the hosts of Egypt perished, when they sank as lead in the mighty waters, waters again became the power of wrath and of death. And how vividly do the words of Jonah express his sense of being enfolded, as it were, in the power of death. "I cried by reason of my affliction unto the Lord, and he heard me: out of the belly of hell cried I, and thou heardest my voice. For thou hadst cast me into the deep, in the midst of the seas; and the floods compassed me about: all thy billows and thy waves passed over me. . . . The waters compassed me about, even to the soul: the depth closed me round about, the weeds were wrapped about my head. I went down to the bottoms of the mountains; the earth with her bars was about me for ever: yet hast thou brought up my life from corruption, O Lord, my God." And when a greater than Jonah went down, not under typical floods, but under the real power of wrath, how often are "waters" and "floods" used in Scripture as the typical expression of that which

Digitized by Google

poured in upon His holy soul. "Save me, O God; for the waters are come in unto my soul: I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me. . . . Let not the waterflood overflow me, neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me." (Ps. lxix.) And again, "Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit, in darkness, in the deeps. Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves. . . . Thy fierce wrath goeth over me; thy terrors have cut me off. They came round about me daily like water; they compassed me about together." (Ps. lxxxviii.) Other instances might be cited,* but those adduced are sufficient to prove how frequently in the Scripture WATER denotes the power of wrath and of death.

The Apostle Peter also † speaks of the deliverance of Noah at the Flood as typically pointing to the

---

* See for example Lam. iii. 54—"*Waters* flowed over my head; then I said, I am cut off." And again, "Terrors take hold upon him as *waters*." (Job xxvii. 20.) "The *waters* had overwhelmed us, the proud *waters* had gone over our soul." (Ps. cxxiv.) "When thou passest through *the waters* I will be with thee." (Isa. xliii. 2.) "In the *floods of great waters* they shall not come nigh unto thee." (Ps. xxxii. 6.) "Water" is also used as emblematical of the destruction caused by devastating armies: "Behold, *waters* rise up out of the north, and shall be an overflowing flood, and shall overflow the land, and all that is therein." (Jer. xlvii. 2.)

† The Apostle (1 Pet. iii. 20), speaking of the Ark, says—"Wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water, which, that is to say, baptism (not the washing away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience unto God) doth also now save us by

Digitized by Google

same deliverance which Baptism typifies to us. The waters descended from on high, and broke up from beneath. They overwhelmed, and for a season buried the ark and Noah in it. But the ark was fitted to confront their power. It was a covered vessel, and by reason of its own native buoyancy it rose upon the surface of the waters, which thus, though the cause of destruction to all beside, became, because of the ark, a means of deliverance unto Noah. They separated him from a judged and ruined earth; they bore him away from the ruin that lay hid beneath; they raised him above its power, and they bore him on to his appointed resting-place in a new world. Thus, that which was destruction unto others, because it met them apart from the ark of refuge, became to Noah and all who were in the ark, deliverance and typical salvation—the ark typifying, not the Church, as some have deceivingly said, but Christ. Christ is the true Ark, who hath borne safely through real floods of wrath all who are in Him. The wrath that was caused to pour down upon Him, and upon ourselves as represented by and one with Him, has been the means of separating us for ever from a condemned world, and of causing us to enter, in Him when He rose above the power of death, into new circumstances of life and glory and blessing for evermore. Water at the

means of the resurrection of Jesus Christ," &c. The right reading in this passage is *διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος ὃ* (not *ᾧ*) *καὶ ἀντίτυπον βάπτισμα*. For further remarks on it see Appendix C.

Google

Flood typified the power of wrath commuted in the case of Noah into a means of blessing because of the ark: water in Baptism typifies also the power of wrath commuted into a means of life to us because of Christ. Water, therefore, as used in Baptism, being a corresponding type (*ἀντίτυπον*) to water as seen at the Flood, is said by the Apostle, *typically* to save. As Noah was raised above the waters by means of the ark, and borne into a new world, so we are raised above the power of wrath in Christ, and are, in Him our risen Head, brought into the new creation of God.

In the Epistles, Baptism is frequently referred to as the sign to believers of their death and resurrection in Christ their Representative. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we WERE BURIED WITH HIM in baptism into death," &c. (Rom. vi. 3, 4.) And again, "If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." (Rom. vi. 5.) And again, "BURIED WITH HIM in baptism, wherein also ye WERE RAISED WITH HIM (*συνηγέρθητε*) through faith in the operation of God who raised him from the dead." (Col. ii. 12.) No words can be more plain than these. When, therefore, at Baptism, we are placed beneath the typical waters of death, God by that sign signifies that He regards us as having gone under that power of death into which Jesus went as

Digitized by Google

our Representative; and in commanding us to be raised from the water, God further signifies that He regards us as raised IN, and TOGETHER WITH, Him who continues to be our Head and Representative in the new world of glory. Baptism is on the part of God *a seal* also, whereby He visibly pledges His faithfulness and His power to maintain the blessings and effectuate the results that are in this sign signified.* Baptism, therefore, viewed as a sign directs our thoughts to blessings already secured by the finished work of Christ. It symbolises not any uncompleted or future act of God towards us, but that which He hath already accomplished for us by the death and resurrection of His Son. If any one were to teach that the emblems of the broken body and shed blood set before us in the Lord's Supper, did not point to the finished work on Calvary, but to some work of the Holy Spirit or other uncompleted or future operation of God, should we not reject such doctrine as heresy? Let

* The force of the past tense in the texts above quoted should be noted (Συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ) "we WERE or DID BECOME buried with Him." These texts refer to a work *already accomplished* for us, and therefore cannot be interpreted of any that is yet unaccomplished, such as the continuous mortification of our "old man."

Some, I scarcely know on what principle, have objected to our speaking of Baptism as "a seal" on the part of God. But surely if we may speak of circumcision as being to Abraham a seal of that righteousness which God imputed to him whilst yet uncircumcised, we may equally say that Baptism is a seal of that forgiveness and those other blessings which God granteth to a believer whilst yet unbaptized. See also Appendix J.

Digitized by Google

us then be equally careful not to corrupt the doctrine of Baptism. The work of the Son is not to be confused with the work of the Holy Spirit; and that which is accomplished and past is to be distinguished from that which is continuous and future. When the Apostle says, "I HAVE BEEN CRUCIFIED with Christ" (Gal. ii.); or again, "YE DIED" (Col. iii.), and "ye WERE QUICKENED together with Christ" (Eph. ii.), he directs to something past and accomplished. The practical exhortations to live as those who HAVE DIED and HAVE RISEN are grounded on the fact of our HAVING already died, and already risen in our Representative.*

* "The eminent thing," says Goodwin, "signified and represented in Baptism, is not simply the blood of Christ, as it *washeth* us from sin; but there is a farther representation therein of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection in the baptized's being first buried under water, and then rising out of it: and this is not in a bare conformity unto Christ, but in a representation of a communion with Christ in that, His death and resurrection. Therefore it is said, 'We are BURIED with him in baptism': and 'wherein ye are also RISEN with him.' It is not simply said, *like as* he was buried and rose, but *with Him*. So that our communion and oneness with Him in His resurrection is represented to us therein, and not only our conformity or likeness unto Him therein. And so baptism representeth this to us, that Christ having once in Himself sustained the persons of all the elect in His burial and resurrection, that now upon the party himself who is baptized, is personally, particularly, and apparently, re-acted the same part again in his baptism: thereby showing what his communion with Christ before was, in what was then done to Christ: that he then was buried with Christ and rose with Him: and upon that ground is now in this outward sign of baptism (as in a show or representation) both buried and also riseth again."—*Goodwin's "Christ Set Forth,"* § III., ch. vii.

Digitized by Google

And as we have too much forgotten Christ and His finished work, in thinking and teaching respecting Baptism; so we have too much forgotten Him in thinking and teaching respecting REGENERATION, of which Baptism is the sign. Indeed there seems to be in us a perpetual tendency to regard so exclusively those *results* of the work of Christ which reach us here through the Spirit, as to impair, if not destroy, our apprehension of the person and work of the Son who is the procuring cause and preserver of our blessings, and in whose glory we see the final consummation to which ourselves are to be brought as joint-heirs with Him. Thus, in thinking of regeneration, our thoughts not unfrequently restrict themselves to that act of the Spirit whereby He creates within us that "new man" which is the embryo of our future condition in glory. But how does the Spirit thus quicken us? By directing us *through the word of the Gospel to Jesus as the object of faith*—that object in whom dwells not only life, but quickening communicative power of life; so that no one can look believingly on Him without being quickened with new and heavenly life. Life is not communicated apart from Jesus, but by the Spirit causing the soul to look in faith to Jesus according to the Gospel. The use which the Spirit maketh of the preached word in regenerating, is emphatically marked in the Scripture. Thus when the Apostle Peter speaks of believers being "born again not of corruptible seed, but of

incorruptible," he adds that they are thus born again "by (διὰ) the word of God," and then subjoins, "and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." * But how is that word the instrumental means of quickening? Because it directs to Christ the quickening One—Him whom no man can behold in faith without LIVING. Thus when Nicodemus in his enquiry respecting regeneration said, "How can these things be?"—that is, *how* can a man be born again?—the Lord Jesus replied by speaking of Himself as the antitypical Serpent of brass. He said, Whosoever shall look in faith to ME, as the perishing Israelite looked at the Serpent of brass, shall have "eternal life," *i.e.*, he is born again. How important, then, to remember that the Spirit of God in quickening, directs the soul to Jesus, because in Him communicative power of life is.

But more than this. In thinking of regeneration our thoughts are not to be limited to the fact of the new man being created in us, important as that is. The word "regeneration" must not be restricted in its meaning. It necessarily implies two things: first, the being liberated from our present condition

* In the same way the Apostle Paul speaks of Christ having cleansed the Church BY THE WORD. (ἐν ῥήματι) "Having cleansed it by the washing of water by the word." Eph. v. 26. That is, the word of the gospel brings to Him; and He, as soon as He is believed in, cleanses with the true antitypical washing, that washing which water, in its various typical applications, symbolises.

Digitized by Google

of being: secondly, the becoming possessed of a new condition of being in place of that which has been laid down. And as there is, on the one hand, an *entire* divestiture of our old condition of being, so as for us to be freed from *all* those earthly characteristics which attach to us, whether in body, or soul, or spirit, as children of the first Adam; so, on the other hand, there is a possession in body as well as soul and spirit (first, in title: finally, in fruition) of all that new and glorious character of being which is now seen in the Second man—the Last Adam glorified. In heaven, when the hour comes for all the redeemed to be glorified—when they shall bear no longer the image of the earthy, but the image of the heavenly—when they shall be changed outwardly, as well as inwardly, into the likeness of Christ, they will realize the full and proper meaning of regeneration. And to what cause will they then ascribe the reception of this new regenerated being? Will they not ascribe it to the union granted to them with that mighty Substitute and new Covenant-Head, who being essentially Life and the quickening One (ὁ ζωοποιῶν)—being therefore the cause, but not the subject of regeneration, did for their sakes enter the dark womb of death, in order that He might bear them through it, and bring them thence into that new, and heavenly, and glorious condition of being proper to Himself as the Son of the living God? Surely the redeemed in glory will not fail to recognise Christ as the

procuring cause of their regeneration: nor will they fail to appreciate what regeneration means. They will understand then the difference between that which is derived from the first man who is earthy, and that which is derived from the Second man, the Last Adam. But although the full results of regeneration will not be seen until Christ shall return, yet all the family of faith are, the moment they believe, regenerate; first, because they have a Representative in whom they have life; secondly, because the new man is already created in them by the quickening power of the Spirit; thirdly, because that Spirit becomes the indwelling and directive power of that new life which He hath communicated. Believers, therefore, have already entered, though indeed amidst many hindrances, on the interests and employments of their regenerated being.

Unless, then, Jesus the Son of the living God, had, as the new Covenant-Head of His people, borne them into and through judicial death, and again brought them out of that death by union with His own heavenly Person, they never could have seen the kingdom of God. We must enter, as it were, the womb of death—judicial death. Death must become our parent—our mother. We must be born of death; otherwise our old condition of fallen being would remain. We must moreover be born of the Spirit—our parentage must be of Him also; otherwise we could not become possessed

Digitized by Google

of that new, glorified, and spiritual condition of being which is needful for the kingdom of God. Accordingly, the Spirit as the quickening agent, gives to believers, the moment they believe, vital union with Him who as the Head and representative of His people, bore them through judicial death into a new condition of heavenly being which is not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit—the Spirit being the formative and effective power of all that pertains to us as born into the new world of glory in Christ Jesus. To the Spirit, therefore, is fitly ascribed our *paternal* parentage; seeing that through Him, instrumentally, "that mighty power which raised Christ from the dead" reaches us, and brings us into vital union with the life that is in Christ risen. Thus we can easily understand the words of the Lord Jesus to Nicodemus, "Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit," &c.—WATER being here a figurative word denoting to the ear that which water, as used in Baptism, denotes to the eye, namely, death—judicial death. In Christ as our Representative, we have passed into and through the womb of death; and in Him, through the quickening power of the Spirit, we have been born out of it. To death, therefore, our *maternal* parentage is fitly ascribed. And even as the waters of the Flood are said to have "wiped out" (מחה. Gen. vi. 7; vii. 4, 23) all flesh from off the earth, so that the earth was thereby cleansed and purified, so the

Digitized by Google

judicial death through which we have passed in our Substitute, is regarded as having "wiped out" all that characteristically attaches to our earthy and corrupt being as children of the first Adam; and we are cleansed of ourselves.* "Water," therefore, whether used as a figurative *word* (as in our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus) or as a symbol *addressed to the eye* (as in Baptism) is a fit expression of cleansing by means of judicial death. How should our faith rejoice in being allowed to recognise ourselves and all believers as having been thus cleansed, separated from our earthy selves and all that characterizes us as of the flesh, and brought into the inheritance of a new condition of being, no longer earthy, but which is as the wind, unfettered by the laws of earth, untraceable as to its comings and goings either by the eye or by the thoughts of man! Such is the character of that new condition of being which is already ours in Christ: such will be our actual condition as soon as He shall return to change us into the likeness of His glory. Well, therefore, may the Apostle connect the thought of regeneration with the resurrection of our Head, when he speaks of God as "having BEGOTTEN US AGAIN (*ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς*) unto a living hope, BY THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD." Thus too the Apostle Paul speaks of our having received "*the washing* of regeneration," *i.e.*, the washing

* Appendix A.

Digitized by Google

which regeneration brings—a regeneration effected for us through union with Christ in death and resurrection, whereby alone we are cleansed of ourselves. *

---

* If water in John iii. 5 meant *Baptism*, then no one who is not baptized (and that in the way appointed of God, for we could not suppose that a self-devised way would be recognised) could be saved; for the words are most positive: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." I suppose no Protestant will affirm that every unbaptized person, and every person not baptized in the right way, is necessarily lost. "As regards this passage," says Calvin, "I am by no means induced to believe that Christ speaks of baptism." (Quantum vero ad hunc locum attinet nullo modo adducor, ut Christum de baptismo verba facere credam.) It is true, indeed, that no one except he pass in the great Substitute through that death which "water" symbolises, can be saved; but it is also true that every one who has believed (like Lydia, for example, when she received the words of Paul) has passed through the death that "water" symbolises, and is therefore "born of water" before he is baptized at all. If "water" signifies baptism in this passage, then the declaration of our Lord that "*he that believeth* HATH everlasting life," would be falsified, and St. Paul would have been unable to say, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel"; and Peter would have been unable to say that we "are born again by means of the word of the gospel."

In John vi. 47 our Lord says, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life"; and immediately afterwards adds, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life," thus identifying faith with eating. Ritualism, however, teaches that this last verse refers to the Lord's Supper; and yet the thousands who believed at Pentecost had everlasting life, and therefore had eaten Christ's flesh, and drank His blood, before they had even heard of the Lord's Supper. The Lord Jesus necessarily instructed His disciples, before the Comforter came, in parables and figurative language; to be unfolded, like the types of the Old Testament, when the Comforter came to explain and bring to their remembrance what the Lord had said. If we refuse to explain symbolic language symbolically, we may as well adopt the doctrine of tran-

Digitized by Google

Baptism, therefore, being the sign and seal of such blessings, is necessarily a eucharistic rite. We therein acknowledge what God hath accomplished for us in Christ. We thank Him that we HAVE DIED; that our old man HATH BEEN crucified; that it is "nullified" (*καταργούμενον*) though not yet actually destroyed. We thank Him that we have been co-quickened and co-raised with Christ; that we are "alive unto God in Him."

But if our thoughts are not thus led to Christ and that which has been effected for us in Him, but are directed instead to the continuous mortification of sin in ourselves; if we are taught that in Baptism we enter into covenant with God to put our natural selves to death, and that the blessings indicated by Baptism are forfeited or endangered if we fail in our stipulation; if we become so occupied with our own efforts against our "old

---

substantiation at once, and say that the material cup which the Lord held in His hand was not a cup at all, but the new covenant. When men wish to darken the truth they can easily perplex themselves.

In John iii. it should be observed that it is not the Spirit that is compared to the wind, but he that is born of the Spirit—"*so is every one that is born of the Spirit.*" In other words, we become possessed (viewed as a part of the new creation of which Christ is the risen Head) of a new condition of being, so that there we are no longer fettered by the laws of earth, but are as the wind. This will be *manifested* at the hour of resurrection, and will be the *last* great evidence of being born of the Spirit. Sometimes this verse is interpreted to mean that we know nothing as to the means by which the Spirit regenerates: but this is untrue. We know that He regenerates by means of the word of the Gospel directing to Christ. By directing the soul to Christ, He quickens.

Google

man" as to forget that it has been judicially destroyed for us at the Cross of Jesus; we shall soon find the finished work of Him whom the Spirit loves to glorify, fade from our remembrance; and, failing to apprehend the grace of the New Covenant, we shall necessarily sink back into the bondage of the Old.

It is indeed true that we need to mortify ourselves and crucify the flesh with its evil affections (*παθήμασι*) and lusts. This is one great end which God ever keeps in view in dealing with His redeemed children. But the ends of God can only be reached by God's own methods, and His methods are not as our methods. He teaches us respecting the act of His grace in having crucified for us our "old man," before He says unto us, "Crucify it." He tells us that we have been quickened in Christ and seated in Him in heavenly places, before He bids us live as those who are separated from the world unto His kingdom and glory. It is not apart from these truths, but by leading the soul to the habitual recognition of them, that the Holy Spirit practically sanctifies: the great object of that blessed Spirit being to glorify Jesus, and to turn the heart from all dependence on the creature to rest in the power and covenant faithfulness of God. Faith, hope, and love (which must have God for their object, and not any thing wrought in us or by us) are thus acted on, and the soul is strengthened to worship and to give

Digitized by Google

thanks, and to say in truth, "all my springs are in THEE."

It must be obvious, therefore, that the present benefit derived from Baptism must mainly depend on our ability in faith to recognise these things. If we think of it merely as the ordinance by which we are admitted into recognised fellowship with God's people, or simply as the sign of the remission of our sins; and fail to recognise it as indicating those further blessings which union with Christ in His death and resurrection has made abidingly ours, we shall proportionably lack the encouragement and strength which the apprehension of God's goodness necessarily brings. On the other hand, if we appreciate even measurably that which is in Baptism signified and sealed; if we see in it the explanation by God of that which He has accomplished for us in Christ, and His attestation to the security of our blessings; if we habitually keep it before us as that which indicates that we have passed through judicial death into the resurrection glory of our Head—in proportion as we recognise in Baptism, God assuring us of these covenanted mercies, we shall be comforted, strengthened, and enabled measurably to live above the power of circumstances, as those who have indeed a life hidden in the heavens.

I say "measurably," because we must not forget that the present is a day of weakness, and not of strength, throughout all the family of God. If we

Digitized by Google

look at baptized Christendom—that which by the fact of being baptized, makes profession of having died and risen in Christ, we see it as distant or more distant from the place of Truth, than Israel were when they bowed down and worshipped the calf that their hands had made. If, on the other hand, we seek to those, who having discerned the prevailing ruin, turn from it and go without the camp, yet even among them we find weakness rather than strength. The mere fact of separation to the cave of Adullam did not necessarily strengthen those who fled there because they saw that Saul's hand was incapable of guiding Israel aright. The abounding of iniquity causes the love of the greater part (τῶν πολλῶν) of Christ's own people to wax cold. How feebly do we recognise that we have indeed died and risen in Christ: that the world, in relation to us, lies as under the cold waters of death—we separated from it, and separated unto God. The lesson therefore taught to us in Baptism if we apprehend it, is not unfrequently a humbling lesson. Nevertheless, this is one of the methods in which it may become to us a means of present grace. It acts, not as a charm, but by presenting certain truths which it embodies, to the apprehension of our understanding and our heart. If, therefore, its teaching humble us, it will not be without its blessing. "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble." Nor does the weakness and failure of His Church de-

Digitized by Google

stroy His faithfulness. His covenant will He not break, nor alter the thing that has gone forth from His lips. He has effectually delivered us from judgment and from ourselves, and from every thing that is below the heavens; and in redeeming us has redeemed *unto Himself*. Accordingly, we are baptized in His name, the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Whatever relation, therefore, of love or of power the Father holds towards His redeemed children, whatever relation is held by the Son towards those who are, by or in Him, chosen, redeemed, quickened, sanctified, and preserved—whatever relation is held by the Holy Ghost towards those in whom He dwells, as the communicator and sustainer of the new life derived from Jesus—all is ours—blessings indeed past finding out, yet given abidingly by God's faithful grace to those who are born again by means of that word of the Gospel which guides us as needy sinners unto Him in having Whom, we have all things.

Digitized by Google

II.

It has been made, I trust, sufficiently evident in the preceding pages, that Baptism refers to that great past act of God's mercy towards His believing people, in having caused them, in their Surety and new Covenant-Head, to pass through judicial death into resurrection-life—such life as is now seen in Him who is "the first-begotten from the dead"—"glorified above the heavens." It is therefore a sign of REGENERATION: a sign of having passed into a new condition of being: a sign that, in the estimate of Heaven, we stand divested of our natural selves, and of all that characteristically attaches to us as children of the first Adam, and that we are regarded as one with Him who is the risen Head of the new creation of God.

"He that is baptized," says Bengel, "puts on Christ, the second Adam; he is baptized, I say, into a whole Christ, and therefore also into His death: and it is like as if in that very moment, Christ suffered, died, and was buried for such a man; and such a man suffered, died, and was buried" [and it may be added, rose again] "with

Christ." *See Bengel, Rom.* vi. "As touching Baptism," says the Protestant Confession of Sueveland, "we confess that which the Scripture doth in divers places teach thereof, that we by it are buried into the death of Christ, made one body, and do put on Christ." Such is the *symbolic* lesson of Baptism. It is symbolic Regeneration.

Some, in their anxiety to resist the deadly doctrine that Baptism is the efficient means of quickening, have impaired the force of the word "regeneration" in its connexion with Baptism, and explained it as if meaning, merely, admission into the visible Church. But in avoiding Scylla, we must beware of Charybdis. There are errors on the right hand and on the left. When the Scripture speaks of our having been crucified and buried "WITH Christ"—of our having been begotten again by His resurrection, and of our "being alive unto God IN HIM," it speaks of something very different from mere introduction into the visible Church on earth. To be "IN" Him who is known in heaven as "the first begotten from the dead," is to be born into glory above the heavens. We must anxiously watch, therefore, against every thing that tends to obscure so precious a truth, or that nullifies the force of any term or symbol that God may employ for its expression. It is a solemn thing to impair the meaning of such a word as "regeneration," or to hide the import of Baptism as its sign. If we have to beware of unduly

Digitized by Google

magnifying, we have also to beware of depreciating, the ordinances of God.

Baptism then, is, on the part of God,* a public and formal recognition that the persons receiving it have passed through judicial death under wrath in the person of their divine Substitute, and that they have passed through and out of that judicial death into the acceptance and glory of the new creation in Christ risen and glorified, as their Representative above: it is also on the part of God's servants (for they are employed to administer it) a public and formal recognition of the persons baptized, as meet for the communion of God's people here: and thirdly, it is on the part of the persons baptized, a public and formal confession of the name of Jesus, and of the mercies in Him received, and also an expression of their desire to enter the visible communion of Christ's people. It is not a sign known and recognised only by God, applied to such as He may secretly quicken and save—irresponsible agents for example, such as idiots and babes who die in infancy:—but it is a public sign, which His Church on earth are called on to administer and to recognise, and which (unless indeed it be administered without distinction to every one on the wide earth) must be limited to such as are able to substantiate a credible title to its reception.

* I scarcely need say that I am here speaking of Baptism when rightly received, not when received by false profession.

Google

Whom then were Christ's servants commissioned to baptize? Not all men: not infants: but only those whom they had first taught or "discipled." They were not commanded to baptize first, and to "disciple" afterwards; but they were directed to "disciple" first, and to baptize afterward. "Go ye therefore and teach (literally, "*disciple*," *μαθητεύσατε*) all nations, baptizing them," &c. (Matt. xxviii. 19.) Accordingly in "the Acts," which is the record of the manner in which the servants of Christ carried out the commandments of their Master, we find that Baptism in every case *followed* the reception of the word. "*Then they that gladly received the word* were baptized." (Acts ii. 41.) In the 1st Epistle of Peter also, Baptism is declared to be "THE ANSWER OF A GOOD CONSCIENCE unto God": words alone sufficient to decide this question. "The answer of a good conscience" can only be obtained from those who have understood the testimony respecting the blood of Jesus, and made credible confession of His name. Such confession cannot be obtained from unconscious infancy.

When we consider the rapidity with which corruption, both of doctrine and practice, spread throughout the professing Church as soon as the Apostles died, it is wonderful that the practice of baptizing infants should not have been introduced until a comparatively late period. Infant baptism seems an almost necessary adjunct to the doctrine

Digitized by Google

that the waters of Baptism have in themselves a mystic efficacy: and that doctrine was early welcomed. Thus Justin Martyr asserts that "Baptism only can cleanse and purify a penitent," and he also calls it the "water of life."—*Contra Tryphonem*, p. 231. Irenæus says, that "Christ gave to His disciples the power of regenerating to God when He sent them to baptize" (which if it had been true would have prevented St. Paul from saying, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel").—*Irenæus, Adversus Hæreses*, iii. 17. And Clement of Alexandria speaks of Baptism as "grace, illumination, and the perfect laver."—*Pædag.* i. 6.*

---

* Neander observes, speaking of the views that prevailed respecting Baptism in the earliest ages after the Apostles died—"In the case of Baptism we find the prevailing notion of a divine power being imparted to the water, and of its bringing about a sensible union with the whole nature of Christ, for the deliverance of the spiritual and material nature of man. 'As the dry wheat,' says Irenæus, 'cannot become dough and a loaf without moisture, so neither can we all become one in Christ without the water that is from heaven. And as the parched earth cannot yield fruit unless it receive moisture, so neither can we, who at first are but sapless wood, ever produce living fruit without the rain which is freely poured out from above: *for our bodies through baptism, but our souls through the Spirit*, have obtained that communion with the imperishable essence.' . . . Clement of Alexandria agrees with Hermas in thinking that the Apostles performed in Hades the rite of baptism on the pious souls of the Old Testament saints who had not been baptized." *See Neander's Church History*, vol. ii., p. 390. After reading such things as these we can well understand what the Apostle meant by "old wives' fables," and by "the grievous wolves not sparing the flock" that should come in after his decease "teaching perverse things."

Digitized by Google

The words of Peter, however, must no doubt have greatly hindered the establishment of infant baptism. They stood like a mountain in the path; for how could "the answer of a good conscience" be extracted from an unconscious babe? It was apparently some time before even the Judaizing Church could bring themselves unblushingly to answer this question, and to say, "It can be obtained through vicarious sponsors."

When and by whom this device of sponsorship was first imagined it is not easy to determine. "*The use of godfathers and godmothers in the Christian Church,*" says Bishop Mant "*was derived from the Jews, as well as the initiation of infants itself.*" This certainly is a candid confession. "It is by some believed," continues the Bishop, "that the 'witnesses' mentioned by Isaiah at the 'naming of his son,' (Is. viii. 2) were of the same nature as these sureties. In the primitive Church they were so early, that it is not easy to fix the time of their beginning. Some of the most ancient fathers make mention of them, and through all the successive ages afterwards we find the use of them continued, without any scruple or interruption, till the Anabaptists, and other Puritans of late years, raised some idle clamours against them. Some of these there will be a properer place to speak to hereafter. In the meanwhile it may be observed in general, that since the laws of all nations (because infants cannot speak for themselves) have allowed

Digitized by Google

them guardians to contract for them in secular matters; which contracts, if they be fair and beneficial, the infants must make good when they come to age; it cannot, one would think, be unreasonable for the Church to allow them spiritual guardians, to promise those things in their name, without which they cannot obtain salvation. And this too, at the same time, gives 'security' to the Church, that the children shall not apostatize, from whence they are called 'sureties.'" *(Mant on the Book of Common Prayer.)*

Such is this author's apology for sponsorship. No attempt is made to trace it to the authority of Christ or the Apostles. It is traced to Judaism and the practice of the early Church; without, however, any proof (save the absurd allusion to Isaiah) that even the Jews adopted a practice so contrary to all that even nature itself teaches. For it is *not* true that men are accustomed to act upon this principle in natural things. Parents or guardians may, as regards the outward possessions of a child, make certain engagements which the law may recognise: but who ever heard of a parent or a guardian covenanting with respect to a child, that its mind, will, character, and conduct, should without fail be cast in a certain mould, and undeviatingly conform to a certain standard? Would any sane person promise, or would any sane legislature desire that it should be promised respecting another, that he should surely think in a certain

Digitized by Google

way, and that his thoughts should not alter, and that they should moreover be unfailingly acted on? Men doubtless have a certain control over the outward circumstances of others, but they are impotent in binding the understanding, and affections, and will. Yet it is with these powers of the soul that baptismal sponsors are concerned.

If it be indeed true that we can substitutionally repent for others, and make confession instead of others, and make promises respecting the understanding, affections, and character of others, why may we not become the saviours of others? If we can so answer for another at Baptism, as for that person, because of our answer, to become meet to receive remission of sins and the gift of the Spirit (this being, it is said, the necessary result of Baptism) then it is evident that others by our suretyship are brought into a condition of reconciliation with God. To assume any such office of suretyship is to arrogate to ourselves a place that pertains only to the Holy One of God. He as being almighty, has power to effectuate that which He engageth; and therefore to Him alone Suretyship belongeth. But it is otherwise with us who have no power to "make one hair white or black." For a creature to arrogate to himself such a place is a sin never thought of, until Ritualism and priestly pride had made war on Truth and holiness, and had taught the worldliness of apostatizing Christendom to assume to itself prerogatives and

Digitized by Google

powers of which the Church when standing in its integrity never dreamed. "I most earnestly admonish you, men and women, who have become sponsors, to consider that you stood *as sureties before God*, for those whose sponsors you have undertaken to become." Such are the words of one of the most celebrated Fathers as approvingly quoted by the Papists in their Catechism of Trent. And what do these sureties before God promise? Would that in answering that question I had not to quote from the professedly Protestant formularies of the Anglican Church. But in those formularies we find that the sureties "promise and vow" for the yet unconscious babe who is supposed to answer through them, that it will "renounce the devil and ALL his works: the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and ALL the sinful lusts of the flesh:"—further that it will believe ALL the Articles of the Christian faith, and also that it will keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same ALL the days of its life.

I fear to express all that I feel respecting these extraordinary words. The presumption of contracting suretyship is well equalled by the presumption of the vow. In making such a vow as this, we arrogate to ourselves the power and holiness of Christ; for who except he were as Christ, holy as God is holy, could "promise and vow" PERFECTNESS? It is a vow of the renunciation of all falsehood and of all evil, and of

Digitized by Google

unfailing perseverance in all truth and all righteousness. If any mere man has a title to promise perfectness like this, either for himself or for others, then Israel's estimate of their powers at Sinai was not unwarranted. They did well in saying—"All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Israel *would* use these words: they *would* promise and vow as if they had strength to determine their own ways, and to fashion their own hearts; and the result is that they have scorned and rejected GRACE, and are now perishing in their sins. They have never understood the difference between God entering into a covenant of PROMISE with them, and their entering into a covenant of works with Him. It is not indeed to be wondered at, that the careless multitudes of Christendom, ignorant as they are of the distinction between the claims of Sinai and the peace of Zion—the mount of grace, where the blood of sprinkling is—it is not to be wondered at that such men should adopt the words that have been quoted, and imagine that they honour God just in proportion as they give strength to the expressions in which they vow and promise entire obedience to all His laws. But for a Christian who knows the worthlessness of his own heart, and the worthlessness of the hearts of all men, to quench the light of the gospel of the grace of God which alone saveth, by the use of such words as these, is lamentable indeed. Rome and infidelity may well exult when they see servants

Digitized by Google

of Christ entangled, and entangling others, in such meshes as these. Let early ecclesiastical history be honestly searched, and it will be found that this system of sponsorial vowing was not introduced until the professing Church had thoroughly Judaized; had given itself over to worldliness; and had lost all proper apprehension of God's method of justifying through the vicarious sufferings and obedience of Another. The *distinctive* truths of Christianity as revealed in the Epistles of St. Paul were set aside: whilst the mutilated portions of Truth that were preserved, were such as could without much difficulty be interwoven with any system of Jewish or philosophic morals. It may safely be said, that during the first three centuries, no writer whose name has descended to us, has drawn or was capable of drawing a clear scriptural contrast between the first covenant, its accompaniments and results, and the new covenant, its accompaniments and results, as revealed in the eighth chapter of the Hebrews. It could not be, but that any practice or ceremony introduced during such a period must savour of Sinai, and not of Zion.

I am well aware that many devoted Christians who would lay down their lives rather than assent to the doctrines of baptismal regeneration and vicarious confession by sponsors, do nevertheless cling with great tenacity to the practice of baptizing those who by reason of their tender age are unable to receive instruction respecting Christ, or to make

Digitized by Google

confession of faith. Baptism is by such regarded chiefly as a means of commending their children to the Lord: and when (as must be the case in every Christian parent's bosom) the affections of the heart, and the leading of the Holy Spirit, concur in causing them to desire to commit their children to Christ, we cannot wonder that they should set high value on an ordinance which they conceive to be the appointed mode of committing their offspring to the love and faithful care of Jesus, and of dedicating them to His service.

Far be it from me to say one word that would hinder Christian parents from commending and dedicating their infant children to Christ. It is the unquestionable duty and privilege of every Christian parent to obey those words of graciousness and love —"Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." Who after hearing these words can doubt that it is the desire of the Lord Jesus that infant children should be brought unto Him, not because they are innocent, but because they are "lost," and therefore need a Saviour. "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Who can doubt that He will receive those who by prayer, whether public or private, are truly commended unto Him? Who can doubt that parents who have thus commended their children to Christ, and have afterwards sought to bring them up, not for the world or the world's greatness, but "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"—who

Digitized by Google

can doubt that such will early see their children become confessors of the name of Jesus, and able, through His blood, to return "the answer of a good conscience unto God"? But until they are able to return such "answer," the Word of God forbids us to say that they can be fit recipients of Baptism.

For Baptism is not a mere act of dedication. It is on God's part the sign that the recipient is formally recognised by Him as having died and risen in Christ, and as having title to all the blessings consequent on the confession of the name of Jesus. On the part of the recipient it is his eucharistic acknowledgment of the relation of grace in which God has thus set him. It is also his introduction into all the privileges of communion with Christ's people; none of which (communion at the Lord's Table among the rest) are to be withheld from the baptized. Even then if it were made known by special revelation from Heaven, that the infant before us had been quickened by the Spirit of God into vital union with Christ, yet, until the seed of new life had so germinated in that infant as to effect "the answer of a good conscience unto God," we should not be justified in baptizing it—God having appointed such "answer" as a qualification not to be dispensed with.

The evidence attempted to be deduced from Scripture in support of the baptism of infants, is slender indeed. It is said, that in the many "households" referred to in Scripture in connexion

Digitized by Google

with Baptism, there *may have been* infants. It is no doubt true that there *may have been* infants, or there may *not* have been. The one supposition is as probable as the other. But even if there were infants in any such households, it is very certain that the Apostles, who knew that their Master had appointed "the answer of a good conscience unto God" as a prerequisite to Baptism, did not baptize those who were unable to return such answer. And if it be asked why express direction for the exclusion of infants is not given, we reply, that Scripture is not accustomed to supply instruction that is unneeded. When we read in the narrative respecting the jailer at Philippi, that Paul and Silas "spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to ALL that were in his house," we need not be told that infants, to whom the word of the Lord *could not* be so spoken are to be excluded from that "ALL." And when in the next verse we read that the jailer was baptized, "he and ALL his, straightway," we are expected to apply the same principle of limitation, and to say that "ALL" must be restricted to such as were by God's well-known appointment fit subjects of Baptism. If our common sense limits the "ALL" in the first case, our knowledge of God's revealed will limits it in the second. By the ordinary exercise of our understanding we know that infants cannot hear and understand the preached word, and therefore we exclude them from the first "ALL"—we learn from Scripture that in Baptism

there must be "the answer of a good conscience unto God," and therefore we exclude infants, and also idiots, who cannot return such answer, from the second "ALL." Whether, therefore, there were or were not infants in the households referred to, our conclusion will be the same. They were *not* baptized. The requirement of "the answer of a good conscience" is a universal law; and, as such, must be applied in every case of specific action that falls under it.

Another argument has been founded on the following passage in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." (1 Cor. vii.) This passage has been by some supposed to teach that the children of a believing parent become by the fact of birth "saints" in the sight of God: saints in the sense in which believers are "saints." Now, even if it were true that God had said that all the children of a regenerate person should be themselves regenerate, yet this would not authorize us to baptize such children until they were themselves able to render "the answer of a good conscience unto God." But does this passage teach

that the children of a believing parent are *by birth* any thing else than "children of wrath, even as others"? Does it teach that anyone by the mere fact of being the child of a believing parent, is thereby personally a saint in the sight of God? Alas! in many a case where both parents are believers, we see unmistakable evidence of their children being far indeed from the kingdom of God. Moreover, if it were true that children, in virtue of birth from a believing parent, were thereby personally sanctified in relation to God, it would be also true that an unbelieving wife if united to a believing husband would be thereby personally sanctified in relation to God: for the word "sanctified" is used of an unbelieving wife who is united to a believing husband. "The unbelieving wife," says the Apostle, "is sanctified by the husband." Yet that she is not personally sanctified in relation to God is evident from the following verse, where she is spoken of as an unbeliever needing to be saved. "How knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?" In what sense then are the children and the unbelieving wife spoken of as sanctified? They are sanctified to the use of the believing husband and father; so that he need not put them away as unclean. Under the Law, if an Israelite contracted marriage with a Gentile stranger, he became defiled and guilty. The Gentile wife was to him an unclean, unsanctified thing. The children also were unclean; and both children and wife were to be put away.

Digitized by Google

See, for example, the scene of sorrow described in the tenth of Ezra. "We have trespassed against our God, and have taken strange wives of the people of the land; yet now there is hope in Israel concerning this thing. Now therefore let us make a covenant with our God to put away all the wives, and such as are born of them, according to the counsel of my lord, and of those that tremble at the commandment of our God; and let it be done according to the law. Arise; for this matter belongeth unto thee: we also will be with thee: be of good courage, and do it. Then arose Ezra, and made the chief priests, the Levites, and all Israel, to sware that they should do according to this word. And they sware." Such was the requirement of the Law. Was then the same rigorous enactment repeated under the Gospel? No. The unbelieving wife and children were not to be regarded as bringing taint upon the believing husband. They were not, in that sense unclean, but sanctified and holy—sanctified and holy as respected the use of the believing parent, so that he might retain them without thereby incurring the anger of the Lord.

Another argument is founded on the analogy between Baptism and circumcision. If circumcision was administered to infants in Israel, why, it is asked, should not Baptism be administered to infants under the Christian covenant?

To this we reply, that we admit the analogy between circumcision and Baptism. But what is

Digitized by Google

analogy? It is a resemblance between the *relations* in which two things stand to certain other things: not a resemblance between the two things themselves. When we say that as a wing is to a bird, so is a sail to a ship, we assert a similarity between a certain relation that the wing holds to the bird, and that which the sail holds to the ship: but we assert no further likeness between the wing and the sail. We do not say that they are in other respects alike, because they happen to have this similarity of relation. We should think it very strange if, because of this similarity *of relation* any were to ignore the many and obvious distinctions that exist between a wing and a sail. Again we may say, that as was the foresight of the unjust steward in relation to the prospects that interested his wicked heart, so should the foresight of the children of the kingdom be, in relation to the prospects that interest their hearts. This is an argument from analogy—a resemblance of relations: but it implies no further likeness between the foresight of the wicked and that of the children of faith. So also with respect to circumcision and Baptism. It is true that circumcision as the initiatory rite of the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants, does stand to those covenants in the same relation in which Baptism the initiatory rite of the New Covenant stands to that covenant. But this resemblance of relation does not imply that the distinctive differences of circumcision and Baptism are to be ignored.

Digitized by Google

The differences are most marked and important. It was a positive enactment of God that all children of Abraham *according to the flesh* should be circumcised on the eighth day:—the testimony of the parents or other competent witnesses *to the fact of the birth* being all that was required as a prerequisite. They were circumcised, not because of any moral or spiritual qualifications in themselves, but simply because they were children of Abraham according to the flesh. Baptism, on the other hand, has nothing to do with mere fleshly descent. Not only is it to be administered to none except those who are spiritually children of God, but that spiritual relationship must also be evidenced, and that in the way appointed of God, viz., by personal confession—"the answer of a good conscience unto God." Therefore, although we may truly say that circumcision as an initiatory rite stands to Abraham's children according to the flesh, in a similar relation to that which Baptism (as being also an initiatory rite) bears to those who are children of God according to the Spirit, yet this resemblance of relation does not obliterate the obvious differences that exist between circumcision and Baptism, and those to whom they are respectively administered. We may just as well say that the Old Covenant is in all respects the same as the New, as say that the initiatory rite of the Old in all respects resembles the initiatory rite of the New, simply because they *are* initiatory rites, and as such, signs and seals

of their different, and in many respects, contrasted covenants. *

---

* Circumcision, amongst its other uses, was to Abraham's children a seal of certain outward blessings in the earth that they were to inherit simply on the ground of being his descendants. In this respect it stands in direct *contrast* with Baptism which is given to those who are not to have natural, nor even personal blessings *in earthly things*, but on the contrary, are to have tribulation: the blessings to which Baptism points being unseen and heavenly—*spiritual*, not natural lineage giving a title thereunto. Nothing can more clearly show that circumcision points to certain privileges not included within the scope of Baptism, than the fact of *Jewish* converts receiving both Baptism and circumcision at the hands of the Apostles. Witness the circumcision of Timothy by the Apostle Paul. Obviously, circumcision in this case pointed to certain blessings that Baptism did not. And what were those blessings? I reply, the national blessings covenanted to Israel as Abraham's seed; which national blessings they shall yet have in all fulness as soon as they also become Abraham's children according to the Spirit. Israel is yet to be made the centre of the earth's government and of the earth's instruction and blessing. The calling out of the present remnant from Israel and from the Gentiles into the *heavenly* blessings inherited by "the Church of the first-born," has not taken away from Israel their covenanted national blessings which shall come to them in due season. Therefore, Timothy's circumcision was an attestation that God's covenant of these national blessings to Israel was still unaltered. Timothy, in attestation of the prospects of his nation, might have been circumcised the moment it was proved on competent evidence, that he was descended from Abraham: but he could not be baptized until it was proved that he was also of the faith of Abraham, and this, by God's appointment, was to be shown by his own confession. How distinctly circumcision was given as the seal of God's covenant with Israel touching their inheritance of the Land of Canaan, will be seen by referring to Gen. xvii. It was given to Abraham as a sign and seal of the righteousness of faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised; it was given to his natural descendants as a sign and seal of a peculiar national standing to which they were destined on account of being descended from Abraham. For further remarks on "Circumcision" see Appendix G.

Digitized by Google

I have already observed that, considering how soon after the death of the Apostles corruption both in doctrine and practice overspread the professing Church, we have reason to wonder that Infant-baptism was not introduced at a more early period. "Until the time of the Emperor Trajan," says Hegesippus, "the Church continued like a virgin, pure and incorrupt: but when the sacred band of the Apostles reached the end of their course, and that generation had passed away that had been privileged to hear the immediate instruction of their inspired wisdom, then the conspiracy of godless error commenced, by means of the deception of other teachers who (seeing that none of the Apostles any longer remained) began undisguisedly to substitute for the preaching of the Truth, 'knowledge falsely so called.'" "Instead of St. Paul's doctrine of faith," (says Neander, referring to the same period) "there was to be found no higher notion of faith than a sense of trust on outward authority, which by itself alone could not obtain the reward of eternal life, but must besides have added to it good works done from love. This furnished Gnosticism [and we may add, it has equally furnished Romanism] with a plausible reason for the depreciation of faith." *Neander's Church History*, vol. ii. p. 2. Notwithstanding, however, the extent and greatness of the corruption introduced in the second century, especially by Clement of Alexandria, and

Digitized by Google

his followers, we find no *distinct* reference* to Infant-baptism until the close of the second or commencement of the third century, when Tertullian refers to it, not however in approval, but in condemnation. "What necessity is there," says Tertullian, "to expose godfathers to the hazard of answering for those whom they hold at the fonts? since they may be prevented by death from being able to perform those promises which they have made for the children; or else may be disappointed by their evil inclinations. Jesus Christ says indeed, 'Hinder not little children from coming to me,' but that they should come to Him as soon as they are advanced in years, as soon as they have learnt their religion—when they may be taught whither they are going—when they are become Christians—when they begin to be able to know Jesus Christ. What is there that should compel their innocent age to receive Baptism? And since they are not yet allowed the

* I say "distinct reference," for the attempt to extort from the passage in Irenæus when he speaks of Christ "passing through all ages that He might save them who by Him are *regenerated* 'unto God'"—the attempt, I say, to force the word "*regenerated*" to mean "*baptized*" in this passage where Irenæus is not speaking of baptism, is futile indeed. The like may be said of the comment on the words of Clement of Alexandria—"If any one be by trade a fisherman he would do well to think of an apostle and *the children* taken out of the water." Every one knows the extended use in which both Scripture and the early writers use the words, παῖδες, παιδία, τεκνία, νήπια, as applied to believers without respect to age. Clement's name for his book Παιδαγωγία is a proof. In this passage Clement's reference is doubtless to παιδία as used in John xxi. 5. It was addressed to the disciples when found fishing.

Digitized by Google

disposal of temporal goods is it reasonable that they should be entrusted with the concerns of Heaven?" [Tertullian de Baptismo, written probably about A.D. 304.] "In the first two centuries," says Suicer, "no one received baptism except he was so instructed in the faith, and imbued in the doctrine of Christ as to be able to testify that he believed; on account of those words 'He that believeth and is baptized,' &c. Therefore, to believe was a prerequisite. Hence the order of catechumens in the Church. It was at that time also a perpetual custom, invariably observed, that after Baptism the Eucharist should immediately be given to such catechumens. At a subsequent period an opinion prevailed that no one could be saved unless he were baptized." [Suicer, word Σύναξις.] Gregory Nazianzen, born A.D. 318, whose parents were Christians, and his father a bishop, was not baptized till about thirty years of age.* He taught that infants should not be baptized under the age of three years. "Antiquity," therefore, as it is called, instead of sustaining the practice of Infant-baptism, is against it: but even if it were otherwise we reverence no antiquity except Apostolic antiquity. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to that word it is because there is no light in them." The Scriptures not only make no mention of Infant-baptism

* See Abraham Booth's "Pædobaptism Examined," 1829, vol. i. p. 403, and authorities there cited.

Digitized by Google

(this is allowed even by its advocates *), but they *forbid* it; for they require as a prerequisite "the answer of a good conscience unto God."

In the fourth century, the spread of the teaching of Pelagius, who rejected the doctrine of original sin, supplied the advocates of Infant-baptism with a means of commending their doctrine to many, inasmuch as it stood in such direct antagonism to the Pelagian heresy. But Truth is not to be defended except by weapons taken from its own armoury: nor can any thing more surely subserve the purposes of Satan than for the defenders of Truth whilst opposing him, to be themselves betrayed into a false position. It is not necessary to baptize infants in order to maintain that all the natural descendants of Adam are born under the imputation of his sin, and also inherit from him a depraved nature. Infants are by nature children

---

* Bishop Burnet says, "There is no express precept, or rule, given in the New Testament for baptism of infants." *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles.*—Art. xxvii.

See also Vitringa—"That some in the antient Church long ago doubted, and that others now doubt, whether infants ought to be baptized, proceeds principally, I think, from hence:—it is not related as a fact in the Gospels and in the Acts of the primitive Church, that infants were baptized by Christ, or by the Apostles." *Obs. Sac.* L. ii. c. vi. § 2.

Œcolampadius says, "No passage in the Holy Scripture has occurred to our observation as yet, which, as far as the slenderness of our capacity can discern, should persuade us to profess Pædobaptism." *Schyn Hist. Memnonit.* p. 168.

For these and similar quotations from various writers, see Booth, 1829, Vol. i., pp. 303-308. [Alex. Carson, LL.D. "Baptism, its Mode and Subjects," ch. iii. 1844.]

Digitized by Google

of wrath, and as such need salvation through the blood and righteousness of Another.

Some indeed have intimated that they who reject the baptism of infants do also exclude from salvation those who die in unconscious infancy. But this is untrue. The merits of Christ being infinite, God is able to accept any therein in strict consistency with His righteousness; and that He does so accept all infants who die in irresponsible infancy is revealed in the Scripture. We have the consolation of knowing that all who, in unconscious infancy, are called into another world, are *in* Christ, washed in His blood and invested with His righteousness. God secretly quickens them in Him. The fact of their being called away before they have attained to years of responsible action, is the proof to us that they are accepted in Christ.* And if it be

---

* The proof that infants who die in unconscious infancy are accepted in Christ, may thus be supplied from the Scripture.

We are taught in Romans iv. 15, that "where no law is, there is no transgression": and again in Romans v. 13, "sin (*i.e.*, in the sense of personal transgression) is not entered in the account (οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται, compare Philemon 18) where there is no law."

Hence we learn that infants and idiots who are not under any recognized law, have not any act of sin entered against them in the great book of account. Further, from Rev. xx. 12, we learn that none will be called before the "great white throne" to be judged, except those against whom certain committed sins have been recorded in God's books. "The dead" it is said—that is, the unbelieving dead, "were judged out of those things written in the books, according to their works." Seeing then, that nothing is recorded in those books against infants who die in irresponsible infancy, such infants will not stand there to be judged. In other words, they are numbered among the saved: and that can only

Digitized by Google

asked why infants when accepted, may not be baptized, our answer is: first we have no evidence that they are accepted until they are removed by death: and secondly, even if it were specially revealed to us that any particular infant or infants were in a state of salvation, yet we should not be authorized to baptize them until they could themselves return "the answer of a good conscience unto God."

In the present dispensation* Christian parents have no promise made to them in Scripture that all their offspring shall inherit salvation because of being their offspring. The children of saints are not necessarily saints. Yet because we affirm this—a truth too obviously proved by facts to be gainsayed—we do at the same time fully own that Christian parents have peculiar encouragement in commending their children to the Lord. He who counts the hairs of the head of His believing people, cannot be insensible to the anxiety of their hearts, touching the salvation of their children. The feelings and affections and sympathies of Christ's people, when

---

be by their having been quickened and accepted in Christ: for how else could the imputed guilt of Adam's sin and their own corrupted nature be pardoned and removed?

* I say "in *the present* dispensation": for in the next dispensation when Israel shall have been nationally converted, they and their offspring shall be "all righteous." "This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord, My spirit that is upon thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth even for ever." (Is. 59, 21).

Digitized by Google

not unholy, are not uncared for by their heavenly Master and Friend. We should have been sure of this, even if He had not expressly said, "Suffer little children to come unto me"; but now that He has Himself used those words of gracious invitation, how can any believing parent doubt that Christ will surely receive any who are truthfully commended to Him, and to His service?

I say, "truthfully commended to Him and to His service," because Christian parents, in remembering the invitation of the Lord to bring their children unto Him, must not forget that He has also left them a commandment to bring up their children in His "nurture and admonition." Must there not, then, be a want of truthfulness of heart, if, after commending our children to His care, we virtually withdraw them from Him, by deliberately training them for the world and the world's service? Do we covet for our children the greatness of this world? Do we wish to see them pillars in the world's ecclesiastical or political systems? Are we anxious that they should become great in the estimate of men as orators, or poets, or soldiers, or statesmen, and that so they should lead the tastes and form the manners of the age? Do we educate them for this end? Then we desire not for them the true riches. We desire not that they should follow the steps of Jesus of Nazareth. We wish, perhaps, that they should ultimately be saved; but we do not, with singleness of heart, desire that they should

Digitized by Google

begin and continue and end their days in the service of Christ, His people, and His Truth. *

A Christian parent, if he indeed desire the salvation of his child, is bound to set before it, clearly and unambiguously, the everlasting distinction between the world and the Church of God. He must teach it plainly respecting the privileges and sure blessings of those, who, by true confession of the blood of

* The Apostle in directing Christian parents to bring up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," tells them also to be careful "not to provoke them to anger lest they be discouraged." In dealing with their children, Christian parents must not forget that they are dealing, not with perfectness, but with that "flesh in which no good thing dwelleth." It should be the object of the parent, therefore, not needlessly to thwart or irritate his child, but rather to gratify and to please, so far as he can do this without overthrowing the right distinctions between good and evil. When severity is used, it should be such severity, as the conscience of the child, afterwards when it looks back upon the circumstances, will recognize as deserved. It will be well, that, in after life, a child should be able to recur to its early years as a period when its comfort, amusement, and happiness, were studied by its parents. If a Christian parent be obliged, for conscience sake, to deny to his child many amusements and recreations which the world permit, it is the more important that all right amusements and pleasures should be liberally and kindly conceded: avoiding of course undue and foolish indulgence. As regards subjects of instruction, the Scripture, I need not say, stands first. "From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus." As respects other subjects, much must depend on the disposition of the child and the path in life intended for it. As a general rule, let it be instructed in such branches of knowledge, as it would really value, in case of its afterwards becoming a servant of Christ. The knowledge of languages, especially those in which the Scriptures are written, will be always prized by a Christian. In teaching languages, however, great care should be exercised in the selection of authors: else the mind will be early poisoned.

Digitized by Google

Jesus, are numbered among "the saved." He must clearly point out the distinction between those who *profess* to belong, and those who prove by their walk and testimony that they *do* belong, to the Church of God. He must beware of misrepresenting or concealing the privileges of the sheep of Christ's fold, as if they were temporary and uncertain. He must show that the sheep of Christ, as having one fold and one Shepherd, have therefore an abiding unity, however they may be scattered in the present dark and evil day, and however many may be the strangers that have mingled themselves with them and fouled and trodden down their pastures. He must seek to make his child understand that there is a Shepherd, and a fold, and a flock, which the world knoweth not—that "faith" surely bringeth into that fold—that Jesus is "the door" as well as the Shepherd, and that the sheep of His fold "never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of His hand." But whilst thus commending the sure blessings of the Church of God, he must be equally careful to declare that none can rightly be received into its visible communion until they have believed in and personally confessed the name and the blood of Jesus. He must expose the falsehood by which Christendom has blinded itself unto destruction, and show that no one ever was or could be, by means of Baptism, made "*a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.*" Alas! Will a Christian parent indeed con-

Digitized by Google

nive at his child's being ensnared by such a snare as this? Will he indeed permit it to spend its days under this delusion from which it may never awake until it finds itself shut out for ever?

But although a Christian parent dare not, if he be faithful to the Truth, teach his child that any thing save the blood of Christ, personally believed in and confessed, can entitle any to be recognized as standing in *a Church-relation* to God, yet he must beware of allowing his child to suppose that it stands to God in no *natural relation* of goodness and mercy and love. Many Christian parents, vividly apprehending that that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that all are "by nature children of wrath," have, in their anxiety to maintain this truth, fallen into the grievous error of regarding their children as if altogether and in every sense separated from the love, kindness and care of God. They forget that God as the Creator of all men regards them in this respect as "His offspring," (Acts xvii. 28, 29)—subjects, therefore, of His loving-kindness, pity, and care. And although it is true that none, until they have believed, are numbered among "the redeemed," and are not until then recognized by God as *under* the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus, yet men, as men, have many a daily mercy vouchsafed to them, because of the blood of Jesus which has purchased for them those mercies, and which has also purchased for them a suspension of that wrath which would other-

Digitized by Google

wise have instantly fallen upon guilt. Men, says the Apostle, have not been left without witness of God's love, "in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." (Acts xiv. 17.) And besides these bounties of His power, there are also the providential interferences of His mercy, as when He heareth the cry of their distress (Ps. cvii. 28); or as when He listens to repentant supplication and averts, as He did from Nineveh, the deserved infliction (Jonah iii. 10): and last and chiefest of all, there is the gift of His word and the preaching of the gospel of His grace—God himself being engaged in the ministry of reconciliation, "preaching," and that to all men, "peace through Jesus Christ." Are not mercies such as these—all of them, be it remembered, directed towards men as men—perpetual and demonstrative proofs that God is love, and that He cares not only for the bodies, but for the souls of His creatures? Does He not seek them by means of the gospel of His grace? Is it not the will of God, that every Christian parent should speak to his child of Christ—of Christ as the antitypical serpent of brass, bidding him look thereon and live? And can any sinner require a surer proof of God's present love, than is afforded in the fact that such an object has been by God prepared, and by God presented to him in the midst of that moral death in which he lieth? Whilst maintaining therefore the true limits of the Church of God, and the dis-

Digitized by Google

tinctiveness of the covenant blessings which pertain to it, and to it alone, we must beware of raising barriers against the approach of those who are as yet without, by creating in their minds an impression that they are in such sense separated from God as to be in His sight abandoned aliens, utterly uncared for and unsought after by Him. The heart may easily be hardened into increased obduracy, or driven into the recklessness of despair. Shall we then hide the love of God in Christ—that which alone softeneth the rigid heart and is, when received, as the warmth of the summer sun upon the frozen mass that it melteth? The Scripture hides it not. The Scripture raises no barrier between the sinner and Christ. It saith, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth." "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

And now may I not with confidence appeal to every Christian heart, and bid them say whether the spiritual welfare of their children would be most promoted by instructing them in the manner proposed, or, by bringing them, unbidden, whilst yet in unconscious infancy within the limits of the professing Church—teaching them that they are in a covenant relation to God when they are in no covenant relation to Him, and then training them according to the nurture and admonition that pre-

Digitized by Google

vails in Christendom. I speak not now of individuals, or of isolated bodies that may be exceptions to the general rule; but looking on Christendom as a whole, and especially on those national bodies who maintain so earnestly the baptism of infants, I ask, is their nurture the nurture of Christ? Are they indeed as mothers who give to their children the sincere milk of God's holy word, or do they educate for the world and teach the doctrines and traditions of men? For what indeed can they nourish, except for the world? Are they not themselves honoured pillars in the fabric of the world's greatness? They must therefore be with, and for, and of, the world: otherwise the world would not hear them nor honour them. The world loves its own, but its own only. Nor can it be doubted that Christendom's conclusions are just, if its foundation-principle be true. If Ritualism can quicken, no doubt Ritualism can also sanctify, preserve, and save. But if on the other hand it be a deluding phantom—if the fabric that it rears be as a house built upon the sand, then, when the rain descendeth and the floods come, and the winds blow, and beat upon that house, how surely must it fall! And how great will be the fall thereof; how everlasting the wail of those who have hoped in it as a refuge, but found in it everlasting death!

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX A.

On the Laver.

The following extract from what I have elsewhere written, will illustrate what has been said in the preceding pages respecting the being cleansed *from ourselves*; and shows how this cleansing from ourselves was prefigured in the Levitical types. If Nicodemus as a teacher in Israel had understood those types, he would not have so marvelled at what the Lord Jesus taught.* The laver to which the following extract refers was not a type of Baptism, as some have said, but was typical of the same kind of cleansing as Baptism. They were both types of that washing or cleansing that regeneration brings: but they were not themselves that washing. Some have wished (Rome, for example) to translate "washing of regeneration," *laver* of regeneration; but this is altogether inadmissible—λουτήρ not λουτρόν is the word that denotes *laver*. (See Septuagint.)

* It should be observed that our Lord speaks of regeneration as something that takes place on earth (this being the force of ἐπίγειον translated *earthly*) for it is effected by His death and resurrection, and the Spirit bringing through faith into vital union therewith. "If I have told you things which take place on earth and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of things not on earth, but above the heavens."

Digitized by Google

EXTRACT FROM "THOUGHTS ON PARTS OF LEVITICUS."—

"*Consecration of the Priests.*" (p. 284, 1898 edn.)

"The laver is first mentioned in Exodus xxx. It is there referred to in connection with the atonement-money, the holy anointing oil, and the incense.

"The atonement-money was a simple but expressive type of that redeeming blood whereby we are ransomed from judgment and entitled to be numbered among the Israel of God. It was a small piece of money—a half shekel—which every Israelite was commanded to bring whenever numbered; and on his bringing it depended his title to be numbered among the congregation of the Lord. This atonement-money, though indeed it was but small, an Israelite was constrained to provide, and that whenever numbered. *Our* atonement-money, on the contrary (an atonement beyond all price, even the precious blood of the Lamb of God), we provide not. God has provided it for us. And when, even with the feeblest faith, we confess the name of Jesus as our hope, we are regarded as having brought the atonement-money once and for ever, and are enrolled for ever amongst the Israel of God.

* * * * * * *

"If rescue from wrath had been the only blessing that redemption had brought, this series of types would have terminated with 'the atonement-

Digitized by Google

money;' and we should have had no mention of the laver. But the object which God's grace has proposed to itself in redemption is, not merely to buy us back from destruction, but to bring us to Himself, even unto His own presence in heaven, where 'flesh and blood,' that is, fallen human nature as seen in us, cannot enter. 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.' For this, we need to be cleansed, not merely from the guilt of our sins, but from ourselves, our natural selves—in a word, from all that pertains to us as children of the first Adam through whom SIN has entered into the whole framework of our being, and there dwells as a living energetic principle of evil. 'Our old man,' says the Apostle, 'is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;' and that expression, 'old man' comprehends all that we *naturally* are in body, soul, and spirit. From this, therefore, we need to be freed or cleansed: and accordingly, we read that 'our old man has been crucified *with* (*συνεσταυρώθη*) Christ.' (Rom. vi.) In other words, it received its award of judgment when Christ, our Substitute, bore on the accursed tree the wrath due to its evil. And again, 'God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh,' that is, God judicially visited with wrath (*κατέκρινε*) the sin that is in the flesh of believers, when Christ died. Already, therefore, we are regarded as judicially free from our old selves—the evil of our old man

not being imputed to us for condemnation; already new life is given to us in all fulness in Christ risen; already the new man which is the embryo of our new condition of being, is created in us; but an hour is also coming, when the Lord shall return, and the trumpet sound, and the 'new man' be expanded into all the full possession of its heavenly powers, and be clothed with a resurrection body, and the flesh no longer be. Then the full result of being cleansed from ourselves will be manifested in our regenerated condition of being, above.

"The laver, with its cleansing waters, affords a type of Christ as *thus* cleansing us. The priests were always to wash thereat before they entered the sanctuary, or before they handled the holy things of the altar. The laver, therefore, typically removed *all* that unfitted them for the service of the sanctuary. When they had washed at it they stood typically cleansed from themselves. It was to this, doubtless, the Apostle referred when he spoke of our having received 'the washing of regeneration;' that is, the cleansing which regeneration in Christ brings—such regeneration implying that we have died in Him, and thereby been divested of our natural selves; and that we have risen in Him, and thereby become possessed of a new condition of being. Thus God is said 'to have begotten us again (*i.e.*, regenerated us) by means of the resurrection of Jesus Christ.' Christ was not dissociated in death from His mystical body, the Church

Whilst He was in death, it lay, as it were, in death; when He rose from the grave, it was raised together with Him. Many and various blessings result from this: but when our attention is specifically directed to the circumstance of our having been thereby cleansed of our natural selves, the type of the laver is employed. The same thought appears to be intended, when the Apostle speaks of water as well as blood issuing from the side of the Lord in death. The three that bear witness, viz., the blood, and the water, and the spirit (1 John v. 8), answer respectively to the three types in Exodus xxx., the atonement-money, the laver, and the holy anointing oil—all bearing witness to the one great truth, 'that God hath given unto us eternal life, and that life is in His Son.'

"The directions respecting the formation of the laver were remarkable. It was made from the mirrors of the women of the congregation. A mirror is that which reflects ourselves—we behold our own natural face therein. God might, if He had so pleased, have made Christ a mirror to us—One, that is, who should show to us ourselves, and make us conscious of what we are; even as when, by His own almighty power, He made the accusers of the sinful woman so sensible of their own condition, that they went out, conscience-stricken and ashamed, and left Him alone. In meeting Christ, they met One who was able, by a secret act of power which they knew not, to present to them so

Digitized by Google

truthful a view of themselves that they quailed before it. Thus, in the great final day, the impenitent shall again be made to see themselves, and shall be shamed from His presence for ever. But Christ is not thus made a mirror to His believing people. For their sakes, He has passed through fires more terrible than those in which the brazen mirrors were melted when they came forth as the laver. We know Him as having passed through those fires. To us, the mirror is gone, but the laver remains. We find in Him One, who, instead of confronting us with the terror and shame of our own natural likeness, has, on the contrary, cleansed us from ourselves. This, the laver typifies; this, resurrection will finally prove.

"Thus, then, the atonement-money and the laver present us with different parts of the one great salvation—the object of all these types being to present the blessings of redemption in various aspects suited to our experimental need. When first we know the truth, we are wont to dwell most on its broad and general features, such, for example, as the washing of the priests by Moses—that washing being a *general* type of cleanness, without any more minute allusion to the specific nature of the uncleanness, or of the cleansing. The washing at the laver suggests more specific thoughts. It teaches us *from* what, *by* what, and *for* what we are cleansed. And we need this more specific knowledge as we become more experimentally acquainted with ourselves, and our

Digitized by Google

unfitness for the new creation. We need to be taught how effectually we are cleansed from ourselves."

Believers are taught in Eph. iv. that at the moment they believed and confessed the name of Jesus, they "DID" at that time "put off" (*ἀποθέσθαι*, observe the strong *past* tense) "the old man," and from that time they "are renewed (*ἀνανεοῦσθαι*) in the spirit of their minds," and that they DID then "put on (*ἐνδύσασθαι*, past tense) the new man." There is a similar statement in Colossians iii. 9. "Lie not one to another seeing that ye DID put off (*ἀπεκδυσάμενοι*) the old man with his deeds, and DID put on the new man," &c. It is obvious that both these texts are applied, not to *some* in the family of faith, but to *all* the family of faith as such —all being alike spoken of as having put off the old man, and put on the new. Now suppose that any were to claim the application of such expressions to themselves on the ground of practical attainment, could such a claim be sustained? The slightest manifestation of anything that sprang from the "old man" would instantly destroy it. We could never solemnly profess as in the presence of God, that *we have put off* the old man, and *put on* the new, except on the ground of having been separated from our old selves by that which Christ has effected for us. In consequence of being able to say "our old man

Digitized by Google

was crucified with him," the believer has a right to profess himself one who "has put off the old man." The position professedly held by believers corresponds with the condition into which Christ's work has brought them judicially before God. The Holy Spirit is sent to instruct them as to that condition, and to supply them with the grace needed to sustain them in their confession of it.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX B.

On the word "Sacrament."

Some have objected to the application of this term to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, on the ground that it is not so applied in Scripture. This, however, would not be a sufficient reason for its rejection. The word "Trinity" is not found in Scripture, yet it is most properly used as expressive of a truth that *is* found in Scripture. If the term "Sacrament" is to be rejected, it must be, not on the ground of its being unused in Scripture, but because the thought conveyed by it is either uncertain or untrue.

There has been not a little difference of opinion respecting the origin of the term. Some derive it from the use of the word "sacramentum" among the Romans, who employed it to denote the military oath taken by soldiers on enlistment. "The faithful are to be informed," says the Catechism of Trent, "that the word 'sacrament' is differently understood by sacred and profane writers. . . . By some it has been used to express the obligation which arises from an oath, pledging to the performance of some service: and hence the oath by which

Digitized by Google

soldiers promise military service to the state, has been called a military sacrament." *Catechism of Trent, Part II.*, ch. 1. q. 2. This, however, is not the meaning favoured by the Romanists or by the Fathers. Bishop Burnet, however, seems to adopt it, for he observes: "This it is true is none of those words that are made use of in the Scripture, so that it has no determined signification given to it in the word of God: yet it was very early applied by Pliny to those vows by which the Christians tied themselves to their religion, taken from the oaths by which the soldiery among the Romans were sworn to their colours or officers: and from that time this term has been used in a sense consecrated to the federal rites of religion."—*Burnet on Art.* xxv.

If the use of the word be contended for in this sense, we have to reject it utterly. They who make the Gospel a covenant of works may well adopt this sense; but it can have no place in the thoughts of those who remember that although God is pleased to confirm His covenant by oath towards us, yet that we swear not and stipulate not unto Him.

This, however, is not the sense generally adopted by the Greek or by the Latin Fathers, or by the Romanists, or their followers among Protestants. The Latin Fathers for some reason not easily discoverable, chose to adopt "sacramentum" as their translation for the Greek word *μυστήριον*—mystery. Thus in the Ephesians (i. 9), "that he might make known to us the mystery (sacramentum) of his

Digitized by Google

will": and in 1 Timothy iii. 16, "great is the mystery (sacramentum) of godliness."

In the Scriptures the word "mystery" denotes something that remains hidden until God is pleased to declare and explain it. But neither the Greek or Latin Fathers confine to this sense their words "mystery," and "sacrament." They apply these words to all symbols, types, or ceremonies intended to present under an outward form religious truths. "The term mystery," says Suicer, speaking of its use in the Fathers, "is applied to types, ceremonies, parables, and all other sacred things that exhibit one thing to the senses, but another to the mind. All the sacraments are called mysteries." *Suicer, word μυστήριον.*

We cannot wonder that the preservation of this sense of "sacrament" should be deemed of the last importance by those who believe that in the symbol (water, for example, as used in Baptism) there lies hid a secret divine power that operates efficaciously on the recipient. This was the prevailing doctrine of the Fathers—perpetuated by the Greek and Roman churches, and received, with slight modifications, by multitudes in the Anglican church. "Seeing," says Gregory Nazianzen, "that we consist of two parts, soul and body—the one discernible, the other not: so likewise is our baptismal cleansing twofold, effected by water and by Spirit—the one being received visibly and corporeally, the other incorporeally, and invisibly concurring: the

Digitized by Google

one being typical, the other true; purging the very recesses of our being, and coming to the aid of our first birth, makes us from old, new; godlike instead of that which we now are; casting us as in a new mould without the action of fire, and recreating us without crushing us." *Greg. Naz. Orat.* xl. Theodoret says, "By the invocation of the Holy Trinity the nature of the waters is sanctified, and the remission of sins afforded."—*ἁγιάζεται τῶν ὑδάτων ἡ φύσις, καὶ χορηγεῖται τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἡ ἄφεσις. Theodoret on* 1 Cor. vi. 11. Origen speaks of the Baptism of Christ in Jordan imparting "a purifying power to the waters." (*ὥστε δύναμιν αὐτοῖς ἐνθεῖναι καθαρτικήν*). *Origen, Catena in Cap. I. Johannis.* And the words of Gregory Nazianzen are to the like effect: "He, Christ, was baptized as a man, but took away sins as God; not Himself needing purification, but that He might sanctify the waters." *Greg. Naz. Hom.* 38. Thus also in Orat. x. he speaks of a recently baptized person as a new-created soul, which the Spirit by means of water re-fashioned. (*νεόκτιστον ψυχὴν ἣν τὸ πνεῦμα ἀνεμορφῶσεν.*) Chrysostom speaks of our "being put down into the fountain of those sacred streams." Hom. xl. And again, "Baptism is a ransom to the captive, remission of every debt, the death of sin, the regeneration of the soul, a robe of light, a seal not to be violated, a chariot to heaven," &c., &c. *Chrysostom, Hom.* iii. *in Cor.* ii. Basil terms it, "a garment of salvation, a

covering of joy, a raiment of light, yea, rather light itself."

If these writers had regarded Baptism as merely symbolic, and had written thus with reference to the blessings it symbolized, even then such language would have been inappropriate, and for the most part, utterly untrue. But they did not so use it. They meant to say that there was divine efficacy in the waters themselves. Rome could wish little more. Indeed, the following statement in the Catechism of the Council of Trent is temperate compared with much that may be found in the Fathers. "A sacrament, therefore, is clearly to be numbered amongst those things which have been instituted as signs: it makes known to us by external resemblance, that which God, by His invisible power, accomplishes in our souls. To illustrate what we have said by an example; baptism, for instance, which is administered by external ablution, accompanied with certain solemn words, signifies that by the power of the Holy Ghost, all the interior stains and defilements of sin are washed away, and that the soul is enriched and adorned with the admirable gift of heavenly justification; whilst, at the same time, the baptismal ablution, as we shall hereafter explain in its proper place, accomplishes in the soul, that of which it is externally significant." (P. ii. c. i. q. i.) We can well understand, therefore, in what sense "sacrament" or "mystery" is used by those who conceive that

a secret operative divine power like this is hidden within the outward sign.

There are, however, some who, though they reject the doctrine of hidden virtue in the material sign, yet wish to retain the words "mystery" and "sacrament," in the sense of "symbol." Their chief argument is derived from the use of the word "mystery" in Revelation i., where the Lord speaks of "the mystery" of the seven stars in His right hand. But in this passage the word "mystery" is applied not to an explained, but to an unexplained symbol. Many statements and many symbols may be mysteries if unexplained; but there is no instance in Scripture of the word mystery continuing to be used of a symbol *after* its meaning had been made known. Then it ceases to be a mystery, and becomes the explanation of a mystery: and this is the relation in which water in Baptism, and bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, stand to us. They are *explained* symbols, and as such remove mystery, and are not mysteries.

Augustine's definition of "sacrament," viz., that "it is an outward and visible sign of inward and spiritual grace," has been adopted in the Articles of the Church of England; but it is objectionable on two grounds: first, because it may be understood to mean, (and in the vast majority of cases *is* understood to mean) that the inward and spiritual grace is conjoined with the sign; so that in Baptism the act of spiritual regeneration is concurrent with the

application of the water: and secondly, if Baptism is intended to point to blessings conferred by God *by means of the death and resurrection of Christ*—if it peculiarly directs to the past, completed, and *external* work of Christ for us, how can it be said to be the sign of *inward* grace. *THE* object to which Baptism directs the soul, is not the mortifying of "the old man" in us, but to the blessings secured by the death and resurrection of our Representative.

It would, indeed, have been well if the thoughts of Protestants on this subject had been more cast in that mould of thought which appears in the subjoined quotation from the Protestant Confession of France, Art. 34.

"We believe that there be Sacraments adjoined to the word, for the more simple confirmation thereof: to wit, that they be pledges and tokens of the grace of God, whereby our weak and rude faith may be helped. For we confess that these outward signs be such, that God, by the power of His Holy Spirit, doth work by them, that nothing may be there represented to us in vain. Yet we think that the whole substance and truth of them is in Christ Jesus: from which if they be separated they be nothing else but vain shadow and smoke."

If then "sacrament" were understood to mean a sign and a seal on the part of God towards us, of certain blessings effected for us by the death and resurrection of Christ, it would be a word that

Digitized by Google

might be fitly and innocently used. But when we remember to what false purposes this word has been perverted, we have good reason to hesitate at the use of a term which cannot now be employed with safety, if unaccompanied by protestation against the deceiving and soul-destroying doctrines it is so often used to convey. The doctrines of "sacramentarianism" are being revived in this country in all their deadly energy, and are again leading thousands into perdition. It is needful that they who love the gospel of the grace of God should testify against them, if needs be, unto death. It is time to have done with compromise and unholy carelessness respecting such things. If there had been a grain of truth in what the Fathers say concerning the regenerating power of Baptism, how could St. Paul have said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." "By the foolishness of preaching" (not by Baptism) "God saveth them that believe."

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX C.

NOTE ON 1 PETER III. 20.

(*Referred to on page* 16.)

—*κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ, εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τουτέστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαὶ διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος, ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, (οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν), δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, &c.

"While the ark was being prepared, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water, which, that is to say, baptism (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience unto God) doth also now, in a manner correspondingly typical, save you by means of the resurrection of Jesus," &c.

I have endeavoured to render this passage as literally as possible: adopting the reading ὃ which is now universally received as genuine instead of ᾧ. The difference of interpretation caused by this change is not unimportant. Instead of regarding water as typifying merely the death through which we have been carried in Christ as the true ark, we have also to view it as signifying the *instrumental*

Digitized by Google

means by which we are cut off from all that is of the flesh, and borne on into new circumstances beyond. The wrath that descended on Christ, and on us in Him, has delivered us, and also separated us from all that belongs to the condemned world. The power of judgment and of death becomes commuted into a power of blessing that bringeth unto life. By means thereof we are saved. We have therefore to retain the translation of διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος—were saved BY water, as given in our version. Baptism, being a certain application of water, necessarily involves the idea of "water," and is therefore in the passage before us used as if it were an expression synonymous with water. "Water, which, as used in baptism, doth in a manner correspondingly typical save you." Observe this passage does not teach us that water or that Baptism saves, but that it *typically* saves. How infinite the difference! *

The meaning of ἀντίτυπον, translated in our version "the like figure," has been greatly controverted. We must be careful not to understand it in our English sense of "*antitype*" as meaning the fulfilment of a type—the substance answering to a

* Even if the word ἀντίτυπον, "correspondingly typical," were omitted, it would be evident to every rightly instructed mind, that "save" as applied to Baptism must mean save *in figure:* for they who have believed, being already saved, *could* only receive in Baptism the *sign* of salvation: but with the word "correspondingly typical" inserted, there is no excuse for the perversion of this passage.

Digitized by Google

previous shadow. The employment of *ἀντίτυπον* in Heb. ix. 24 is sufficient to show that it still denotes something typical, pointing onward to a substantive something, yet to come—the Courts of the Tabernacle formed by Moses being said to be *ἀντίτυπα* of the true heavenly places not made with hands. *Ἀντίτυπος*, however, must be understood as meaning something more than a type (*τύπος*). It means strictly a second or copied type—something copied or imitated from an archetype or model previously existing, with which archetype it is made to correspond. This is emphatically true of the Courts of the Tabernacle, for they were made according to a pattern shown to Moses on the mount. "See, said he, thou make all things according to the pattern (*τύπον*) showed to thee on the mount." Thus what God showed to Moses was *τύπον*, and what Moses made was the *ἀντίτυπος* or corresponding type—itself pointing onward to the reality beyond.*

If we keep therefore *to the Scripture use* of *ἀντίτυπον* as our guide, we must define it to be a type corresponding with some previous type. Consequently when used as an adjective as in 1 Peter

* I am aware that the Fathers use *αντίτυπος* in the simple sense of *τύπος*. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of Baptism as a "figure of the sufferings of Christ"—*τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων αντίτυπον*. Catech. II. Chrysostom says that Baptism is "symbol of the suffering of Christ"—*συμβολον τοῦ πάθους τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Hom. xvi. in Epist. ad Hebræos. Happy would it have been if the Fathers had adhered to this simple truth respecting Baptism.

Digitized by Google

iii. 21, we render it "correspondingly typical." This sense exactly accords with the statement in Peter: for he speaks of Baptism as a type corresponding with a previous type, viz: the typical deliverance of Noah from the old into another world. Αντίτυπος is not merely synonymous with ἀντίστροφος, which would be the word if mere correspondency were intended. The notion of type is to be included also.

As respects the word ἐπερώτημα, it cannot, I think, be more suitably rendered than by the word adopted in our version—"answer." Although the meaning of the verb from which it is derived, viz.: ἐπερωτάω, is "to interrogate," yet we know that its verbal ἐπερώτησις was used in a forensic sense to denote *the reply* to such interrogation.

Salmasius says, "Stipulatio est quæ interponitur ad firmandum pactum quam Græci interpretes ἐπερώτησιν reddiderunt quæ interrogatione fiebat. Dabis? Dabo.—Promittis? Promitto. Hinc et interrogatio sæpe in jure pro ipsâ stipulatione." Thus in a covenant in which the person receiving engages to perform certain terms, ἐπερώτησις means *stipulation*; but in a covenant *of promise*, such as that which Baptism seals, it means simply an answer to terms proposed. "Art thou willing to receive the unpurchased blessings of my grace?" The soul of the believer *answers* unto God, and saith, "I am willing."

It may, indeed, be said that ἐπερώτησις is not

ἐπερώτημα. It will be found, however, that the exchange of these two forms of the verbal is most common in Scripture: for example, κτίσις, κτίσμα —δικαίωσις, δικαίωμα—the distinction being that the first is employed when the mind is to be directed towards the agent as well as the act: the second, when the act *as the result* of the agency is to be made prominent.

Ἐπερώτημα as used by Peter appears to answer to the passive participle (paül) of שאל, viz., something asked for; (hence applied to anything borrowed. *See* 2 *Kings* vi. 5). That which is sought for by an interrogation being *an answer*, ἐπερώτημα by an obvious metonymy would mean "answer."

If, however, any object to this rendering, and prefer as the translation of ἐπερώτημα * *question* or *appeal*, the general sense of the passage is not thereby affected. Baptism may fitly be termed *the appeal* of a good conscience unto God. "Appeal" is better than "question," for it better preserves the forensic meaning of the term.

---

* Tertullian evidently understood ἐπερώτημα in the sense of "*answer*," when he says, "Anima non lavatione sed *responsione* sancitur." *Tertullian, de Resurrectione*, xl.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX D.

THE following extract, referred to on page 2, is from the work of Bishop O'Brien, of Ossory, on "Justification." See Appendix to that work.

"The Council of Trent (Sess. 6, Can. 12) anathematizes all who assert 'fidem justificantem nihil aliud esse quam fiduciam divinæ misericordiæ peccata remittentis propter Christum.' Confidence in the divine mercy, in some sense, is made a part of *the preparation for Justification*, cap. 6; but it would not be easy to determine positively whether it were allowed to be a part of justifying faith or not: as, whatever materials for collecting the views of the Romish Church upon the nature of faith may be supplied by the Decree and Canons of this Session (which are designed to declare the Catholic Doctrine of Justification, 'quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque receperit, justificari non poterit'), no explicit definition of faith is to be found in either. Bellarmine, however, supplies the defect; and I suppose may be received as sufficient authority on the subject. Their divines, he tells

Digitized by Google

us, 'fidem historicam, et miraculorum, et promissionum, unam et eandem esse docent; atque illum unam non esse proprie notitiam aut fiduciam, sed assensum certum atque firmissimum, ob auctoritatem primæ veritatis, et hanc unam esse fidem justificantem.' *De Just.* l. 1., cap. 4.

"It was a long time, I believe, before this view of faith was adopted by any Protestant Divines. When they erred about the nature of the principle, it was naturally in the opposite direction. In fact, as the Romanists denied in terms that *we are justified by faith only*, they had a manifest interest in robbing faith of every thing moral in its nature, as among the modes of vindicating their rejection of this truth; but a Protestant who ceased to hold the doctrine, in the sense of the early Reformers, was still probably bound to their assertion of it in express terms, by the Confession of the church to which he belonged, and lay, therefore, under an obvious temptation to add to the meaning of faith, until it stood for all that he conceived essential to justification. Hence we were told, 'fidem cui justificatio a Paulo tribuitur, pro unicâ ac simplici virtute nequaquam sumendam esse, sed integram Fœderis Evangelici conditionem denotare, h. e. suo ambitu omnia Christianæ pietatis opera amplecti.' *Bull, Harm. Apost. Diss. Post.* cap. 4, § 4.—That faith, 'in the New Testament, stands generally for the complex of Christianity, in opposition to the law, which stands as generally for the complex of

the whole Mosaical dispensation.'—That 'our faith, which includes our hope, our love, our repentance, and our obedience, is the condition that makes us capable of receiving this redemption and free grace,' &c. *Burnet, on the Thirty-nine Articles.* Art. xi. And such a view of the nature of faith became a very common one among Protestants, both in England and upon the Continent.

"How far the palpable unfairness of this mode of neutralizing the doctrine of Justification by Faith only, contributed, by a reaction easily understood, to give rise to the opposite errors concerning the nature of faith, it would not be easy or important to decide. It seems likely, indeed, that the error originated in this way; though those who have most signalized themselves in the support of it were far from setting any high value on the doctrine, and some of them, as we shall see, absolutely reject it.

"Sandeman, his professed followers, and some smaller religious bodies, separated from them by views of church fellowship, but agreeing with them for the most part in doctrine, are the persons alluded to as maintaining that faith is simply *a belief of the truth.* And the same view has been adopted and defended by individual members of almost all churches. I have of these pointed especially to Mr. Erskine . . . He has been very well answered by the Rev. Mr. Carlile, in his "Old Doctrine of Faith," in which students will find, in

addition to a satisfactory refutation of Mr. Erskine, a great deal of important matter in support of the sounder doctrine."

[From "Ten Sermons upon the Nature and the Effects of Faith," by J. T. O'Brien (afterwards Bishop of Ossory). First Edition, 1833. Page 281, *f.*]

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX E.

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 29.

THIS text affords another example of the manner in which Scripture connects the doctrine of Baptism with the hope of resurrection. Some in the Church at Corinth were beginning to teach that there would be no resurrection of the body. Why, then, asks the Apostle, were ye baptized? In Baptism ye professed that ye had hope as to the future: and ye said well, for Baptism does refer to a future hope in resurrection, grounded on the resurrection of Him who has risen as the First-fruits of His people. But if there be no resurrection, what meaning is there in your Baptism? It would be folly to say that your hope respects the grave, and that you are baptized with reference to, or on behalf of, your dead bodies. Baptism cannot imply hope in the corruption of death: and yet there is nothing else to which it can point in futurity, if there be no resurrection.

The Apostle's words are designedly abrupt, and should be pointed thus:

Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι;—ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται. Τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν; "Else, what meaning will there

be in the act of those who are baptized? They must be baptized on behalf of their dead bodies,* if dead bodies rise not at all. Why then are they baptized for them?" The Apostle speaks of the thought of being baptized on behalf of their dead bodies, not only as an absurdity, but as an *acknowledged* absurdity. He assumes that no one would ever think of alleging such a reason for Baptism: and therefore his argument is—"ye must either abandon Baptism, or admit the resurrection."

If then this passage be rightly pointed, it will be seen that there is no such thought in the Scripture as "baptism for the dead": and the thought of

---

* Many interpreters who have adopted other expositions of this passage, admit that σωμάτων or μελῶν is to be suppplied after νεκρῶν. See for example Meyer, Abresch, and others referred to by Olshausen. The following passage from Chrysostom shows that he also was accustomed to supply σωματων. "Τουτο τοινυν αναμμνησκων ὁ Παυλος ελεγεν—ει μη εστιν αναστασις, τι και βαπτιζη ὑπερ των νεκρων; τουτεστι, των σωματων· και γαρ επι τουτῳ βαπτιζη, του νεκρου σωματος αναστασιν πιστευων, ὁτι ουκετι μενει νεκρον." *Chrysostom, Hom.* xl. *in locum.* So also Theophylact: Φησιν ουν, ὁτι οἱ πιστευσαντες ὁτι εσται αναστασις νεκρων σωματων, και βαπτισθεντες, &c. *Theophyl. in locum.* See also Isidore commenting on the same place, Epist. ccxxi., lib. i., p. 64, βαπτιζομεθα ουν ὑπερ των νεκρων τῃ φυσει σωματων. Tertullian likewise has these words: Quid facient qui pro corporibus baptizantur, si corpora non resurgant?

I quote these writers, not as agreeing to their exposition, which was, that the words of the Apostle referred to a confession of the resurrection required of the baptized—a meaning that could not be obtained from the word ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν. I neither agree with their exposition nor with their manner of pointing the passage, but I merely quote them to show that they understand νεκρῶν to mean dead *bodies*.

Digitized by Google

being baptized with reference to any hope attaching to us in death, is only referred to as one too preposterous to be entertained by any. All the laboured expositions, therefore, of this passage (which are admitted to be most unsatisfactory) fall to the ground; for they are attempted expositions of words which, so connected, are not found in Scripture.

As regards the supposed practice of baptizing living persons as substitutes or sponsors for the dead, it was a practice unknown in the apostolic age: and afterwards was adopted only by heretics, such as the Cerinthians and Marcionites. The Fathers reputed orthodox would not tolerate it. As respects the practice of baptizing *over* the graves of martyrs, not a trace of such a custom appears in the apostolic age. It was introduced later by some, probably from a mistaken interpretation of this passage. Nor would any interpretation that requires ὑπὲρ to be understood in the sense of "*super*" (*over*), be admissible: for ὑπὲρ is not used in the New Testament in that local sense.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX F.

On the Meaning of ΒΑΠΤΙΖΩ.

I HAVE not thought it needful, in the preceding pages, to dwell on the force of the word βαπτίζω,* as signifying what it properly does signify, *to immerse.* Suppose it were granted that in some passages, where Christian Baptism is not treated of, this word may be found used in a more general sense, yet how would that affect its use in passages where the fact of its being employed to denote symbolic death and resurrection, necessitates the retention of the proper and natural meaning of the word? It would be strange indeed if a term should suddenly be divested of its *proper* meaning, when that meaning is the only one suited to the action which it is intended to describe.

Accordingly, there are few things about which there has been more accordant testimony in every age, than to the fact not only that βαπτίζω signifies

* Thus Suicer, on the word βαπτίζω— Optimæ Glossæ: βαπτίζω, mergo. Βαπτίζειν ἑαυτόν εἰς θάλασσαν, apud veterem Poëtam est, *mergere se ipsum mari.* Pro βαπτίζω Latini Patres adhibent *mergito. . . .* βάπτισμα vel βάπτισμος notat proprie *immersionem, intinctionem.* Hinc βάπτισμα idem quod κατάδυσις. See also Suicer on the word ἀνάδυσις.

Digitized by Google

to immerse, but that immersion was practised for ages after the Apostles died,* and even now in the theory of the Anglican Church its use is appointed. "Upon the revision of the Common Prayer Book at the Reformation," says Dr. Wall, "the Church of England did not think fit (however prevalent the custom of sprinkling was) to forego their maxim, that it is most fitting to dip children that are able to bear it." *Hist. Inf. Bapt.*, part ii., ch. ix. "That the minister dippeth a child into the water," says Luther, "signifieth death: that he again bringeth him out of it, signifieth life. St. Paul explains it in Rom. vi. Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized, to be entirely immersed, as the word imports and the mystery signifies." *Luther Catech. Minor as quoted by Booth*, vol. i., p. 146. "Baptism," says Salmasius, "is immersion; and was administered in ancient times according to the force and meaning of the word." Calvin says, "The word, baptize, signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was observed by the ancient Church." Beza says, "Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion was signified." Vitringa observes, "The act of baptizing, is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word." But it is needless

* Dr. Whitby says: "that immersion was religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries."—*Whitby on Rom.* vi. 4. See Dr. Wall to the same effect. *Hist. of Inf. Bap.*, pp. 129, 131, 140, 147.

Digitized by Google

to multiply quotations on a point which may be regarded as unquestioned. If any desire to see the amount of evidence that may be accumulated on this subject they may consult the first volume of Booth's "Pædobaptism Examined," from which the above quotations have been selected.

Few who reverence the Word of God will maintain that we are at liberty to alter the *form* of His ordinances, any more than to administer them to unfit subjects. It is very evident that the use of *sprinkling* in Baptism entirely destroys the symbolic meaning of the rite; for sprinkling cannot denote death and resurrection. Are we then prepared to set aside the symbolic teaching of an ordinance whereby God has designed to maintain in His Church a perpetual attestation to the fact of their being one with Christ in death and resurrection? Shall we annul this solemn and blessed truth, and substitute for it some other doctrine that can harmonize with sprinkling as its type? This is what Christendom has done, and accordingly Scriptural thoughts respecting Baptism have well nigh perished.

When Satan has triumphed in causing the servants of Christ to surrender any point of Truth, he will soon seek to repeat his victory. The fact of one surrender will be made the ground of requiring another. If the form of one ordinance be altered, why, it will be asked, may not another be changed? If the rules of Scripture are flexible once, who will say that they are not flexible always? The use that

Digitized by Google

has been made by Romanists of this permitted deviation from Scripture as respects the form of Baptism, may be seen in the following extract from Bossuet. May it be a warning to us all.

Bossuet remarks as follows: "Though these are "incontestable truths, [namely, that baptism is "immersion, and that immersion was practised by "the apostles;] yet neither we, nor those of the "pretended Reformed religion, hearken to the Ana-"baptists, who hold mersion to be essential and "indispensable; nor have either they or we feared to "change this dipping, as I may say, of the whole "body, into a bare aspersion, or infusion on one part "of it. No other reason of this alteration can be "rendered, than that this dipping is not of the "*substance* of baptism; and those of the pretended "Reformed religion agreeing with us in this, the "first principle we have laid down is incontestable. "The second principle is, That to distinguish in a "sacrament, what does or does not belong to the "substance of it, we must consider the *essential* "*efficacy* of the sacrament. Thus, although the word "of Jesus Christ, *baptize*, as has been said, signifies "dip, it has been thought, that the *efficacy* of the "sacrament was not annexed to the *quantity* of "water; so that baptism by infusion and sprinkling, "or by mersion, appearing in reality to have the "same efficacy, both the one and the other mode "are judged good. Now seeing, as we have said, "we cannot find in the eucharist any essential

Digitized by Google

"efficacy of the body, distinguished from that of the "blood; the grace of the one and of the other, as "to the sum and substance of it, cannot but be the "same. It signifies nothing to say, The represen-"tation of the death of our Lord, is *more express* in "the two kinds. I grant it; and in like manner the "new birth of a believer is *more express* in immersion, "than in bare infusion, or aspersion. For the "believer being plunged in the water of baptism, is "'buried with Jesus Christ,' as the apostle expresses "it, (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12); and coming out of the "water, quits the tomb with his Saviour, and more "perfectly represents the mystery of Jesus Christ, "who regenerates him. Mersion, in which water is "applied to the whole body and to all its parts, also "more perfectly signifies, that a man is more fully "and entirely washed from his defilements; and yet, "baptism performed by immersion, or plunging, is "not better than that which is administered by "simple infusion, and on one part only. It is suffi-"cient, that the expression of the mystery of Jesus "Christ, and of the efficacy of grace, is found in "substance in the sacrament, and the utmost exact-"ness of representation is not required in it. Thus, "in the eucharist, the expression of the death of our "Lord, being in substance found in it, when that "body which was delivered up for us is given to "us; and the expression of the grace of the sacra-"ment being also found in it, when the image of our "spiritual nourishment is given us, under the species

Google

"of bread; the blood, which only adds to it a more "express signification, is not absolutely necessary."

Booth quotes further from Bossuet as follows: "The same artful defender of Papal superstition, "in another of his books, expresses himself thus: "'Baptism by immersion, which is as clearly estab- "lished in the Scripture, as communion under the "two kinds can possibly be, has nevertheless been "changed into pouring, with as much ease and as "little dispute, as communion under one kind has "been established; for there is the same reason why "one should be preserved as the other. It is a fact "most firmly believed by the Reformed, (though "some of them at this time wrangle about it,) that "baptism was instituted to be administered by "plunging the body entirely; that Jesus Christ re- "ceived it in this manner; that it was thus per- "formed by His apostles; that the Scriptures are "acquainted with no other baptism; that antiquity "understood and practised it in this manner; and "that to baptize, is to plunge;—these facts, I "say, are unanimously acknowledged by all the "Reformed teachers; by the Reformers them- "selves; by those who best understood the Greek "language, and the ancient customs of both Jews "and Christians; by Luther, by Melancthon, by "Calvin, by Casaubon, by Grotius, with all the "rest, and since their time by Jurieu, the most "ready to contradict of all their ministers. Luther "has even remarked, that this sacrament is called

Google
3459691

"*Tauf*, in German, on account of the depth; be-
"cause they plunged *deeply* in the water those
"whom they baptized. If then there be in the
"world a fact absolutely certain, it is *this*. Yet it
"is no less certain, that with all these authors,
"baptism without immersion is considered as law-
"ful; and that the church properly retains the
"custom of pouring. . . . There is then the
"same foundation for continuing the communion
"under one kind, as to continue baptism by pouring;
"and the church, in supporting these two customs,
"which tradition proves are equally indifferent, has
"not done anything unusual; but maintained,
"against troublesome persons, that authority upon
"which the faith of the ignorant rests.'" See
Booth vol. i. p. 272.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX G.

AUGUSTINE'S REPLY TO BONIFACE, BISHOP OF THESSALONICA.

THE following extract is made from Booth's "Pædobaptism Examined." Vol. I., p. 406:—

"The language of Boniface, bishop of Thessa-
"lonica, in a letter to Austin, is far from expressing
"a warm regard, either for infant baptism, or the
"business of sponsors. 'Suppose I set before you
"an infant,' says he to Austin, 'and ask you, *Whether,*
"*when he grows up, he will be a chaste person?* or, *Whether*
"*he will be a thief?* You doubtless will answer, *I do*
"*not know.* And, *Whether he, in that infant age, have*
"*any thought, good or evil?* You will still say, *I do*
"*not know.* If then you dare not assert any thing
"concerning his future conduct, or his present
"thoughts, what is the reason that, when they are
"presented for baptism, their parents, as sponsors
"for them, answer and say, They *do* that, of which
"their infant age is not able to *think*; or, if it can,
"it is a profound secret? For we ask those by whom
"they are presented, and say; *Does he believe in God?*
"(which question concerns that age which is ignor-

Digitized by Google

"ant whether there be a God). They answer, *He* "*does believe.* And so likewise an answer is returned "to all the rest. Whence I wonder that parents in "these affairs answer so confidently for the child, "that he does so many good things, which at the "time of his baptism the administrator demands! "And yet, were I at that very time to ask; *Will this* "*baptized child*, when grown to maturity, *be chaste?* or, "*Will he not be a thief?* I know not whether any one "would venture to answer, *He will*, or, *He will not*, be "the one or the other; as they answer without "hesitation, *He believes in God—He turns to God!*' "Hence it appears, that in the time of Austin a "profession of faith was always required, prior "to the administration of baptism, agreeably to the "primitive pattern; that when an infant was pre-"sented for baptism, this profession was made by "proxy, as it is now in the church of Rome, and in "the church of England; that Boniface considered "this vicarious profession, as a bold, unwarrantable, "absurd procedure, as it undoubtedly is; and, "consequently, that he was far from being, like "Austin, a sanguine admirer of Pædobaptism; there "being, as Dr. Wall observes, 'no time or age of "the church, in which there is any appearance that "infants were ordinarily baptized without sponsors "or godfathers,' to make that vicarious profession, "against which Boniface with so much reason and "force objects.

"To these difficulties the celebrated bishop of

Digitized by Google

"Hippo, among other trifling and impertinent "things, replies: 'As the sacrament of Christ's "body is, after a certain fashion, Christ's body; and "the sacrament of Christ's blood, is his blood; "so the sacrament of faith is faith; and to believe, "is nothing else but to have faith. And so when "an infant, that has not yet the faculty of faith, "is said to believe, he is said to have faith, because "of the sacrament of faith; and to turn to God, "because of the sacrament of conversion; because "that answer belongs to the celebration of the sacra-"ment. . . . An infant, though he be not yet "constituted a believer, by that faith which con-"sists in the will of believers, yet he is by the sacra-"ment of that faith; for, as he is said to believe, "so he is called a believer; not from his having the "thing itself in his mind, but from his receiving the "sacrament of it. And when a person begins to have "a sense of things, he does not repeat that sacra-"ment, but he understands the force of it, and by "consent of will squares himself to the true meaning "of it. And till he can do this, the sacrament will "avail to his preservation against all contrary "powers; and so far it will avail, that, if he depart "this life before the use of reason, he will, by this "Christian remedy of the sacrament itself, (the "charity of the church recommending him) be made "free from that condemnation which, by one man, "entered into the world. He that does not believe "this, and thinks it cannot be done, is indeed an in-

Digitized by Google

"fidel, though he have the sacrament of faith; and "that infant is much better, who, though he have "not faith in his mind, yet puts no bar of a contrary "mind against it, and so receives the sacrament to "his soul's health.' Such is the solution given by "Austin, which the celebrated Chamier justly pro-"nounces *frigid*. How far any of those who now "administer baptism on the creed of a proxy, "whether latent in the parent, or avowed by the "sponsor, may approve of his reasoning, I cannot "pretend to say; but I think it is plain, that the "New Testament is equally silent about a vicarious "faith, and a vicarious baptism. He, therefore, who "admits the former, could not consistently oppose "the latter, were any to plead for it.

"The very learned and famous Daillé, when "animadverting on this passage of Austin, says: "'Whether these things satisfied Boniface, I know "not. To me, I confess they seem strange. How "can the infant offered to baptism, be truly said, "therefore, to have faith, because he has the sacra-"ment of faith, *i. e.*, baptism, at the time when he "has not yet received baptism? nay, who is for no "other reason asked the question, than that he may "obtain baptism, which as yet he wants? As "though none ought to be baptized who does not "believe. An infant is presented to the minister to "be baptized: the minister, as though he thought it "unlawful to baptize even an infant, except he be-"lieves, demands, and, which aggravates the ab-

Digitized by Google

"surdity, he demands of the *infant himself*, whether "he believes? tacitly implying, he may not baptize "him unless he does so. Here the godfather, that the "infant may be capable of baptism, answers as his "surety, that he believes. When Boniface was in "doubt how the godfather could truly and certainly "affirm this; Austin answers, he could, though the "infant had not yet faith; because when he says *he* "*believes*, he only means, he has the sacrament of "faith. Is not this a brave solution of the difficulty? "But I say the infant has not what you call the "sacrament of faith; nor, if he had, would there be "any occasion to offer him to you to be baptized; "and therefore, in that very sense Austin puts upon "the answer, the godfather lies when he says, the "infant believes, *i.e.*, has the sacrament of faith.' "

I have referred to this letter of Augustine, not so much in proof that Infant-baptism, did not, even so late as the time of Augustine, pass unquestioned, as to show the difficulty which Augustine, although no unready answerer, had in meeting the difficulties of Boniface.

It is obvious that such a reply as that of Augustine could long satisfy none. His doctrine soon found the proper form of its development. in that naked statement of "Baptismal Regeneration," which has been, for so many ages, the bane of Christendom.

Digitized by Google

It is sorrowful to think, that, even at the time of the Reformation, there was a recurrence to this folly of Augustine. Even *Z*winglius, when speaking of the nature of faith required from infants, refers to this very letter to Boniface.* The doctrine, however, finally adopted by *Z*winglius, Œcolampadius, and other of the Swiss Reformers, was very different from that of Augustine; for they evidently did *not* believe with him, that there was a sacramental efficacy in Baptism to impart faith, and consequently to quicken the soul. Yet, it must with sorrow be confessed, that *their* views also were most unsatisfactory and very distant from the Truth. According to *Z*winglius, "Baptism *introduces only into the external and visible Church*, and the faith requisite to it in infants, is the faith of the Church." . . . On the nature of the faith required he refers to Augustine's epistle to Boniface. (*See Scott as above quoted).* "I would not deny," says Œcolampadius, "that the water of Baptism is a regenerating water, for (through it) *he, who was before not acknowledged by the Church, becomes the child of the Church.*" And again: "A peaceably disposed person who understands the nature of sacraments easily understands how a child is received to the grace of God by Baptism. . . . By this symbol the persons present are taught that the child belongs to God's grace—*to the Church*, which enjoys His grace and

* See Scott's Hist. of the Church of Christ. Vol. iii. p. 141.

Digitized by Google

favour as contradistinguished to the rest of the world." * *Scott*, vol. iii., p. 193. In more modern times also, many who reject the dogma of Baptismal Regeneration, are wont to speak of Baptism in this way, as if it were merely a means of admission into the visible Church.† But the Scripture does not so speak of it. The Apostle says: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." (Gal. iii. 27.) Is "putting on Christ," mere admission into the visible Church? And again, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? There-

* This statement of Œcolampadius does not seem very consistent with the passage above quoted. See page 56. There may possibly be something in the context of that quotation that would tend to modify it. This, I have not, at present the means of ascertaining. It is probable, however, that at one period of their lives, the opinions both of Zwinglius and Œcolampadius on this subject wavered. The excesses and fanaticism of the German Anabaptists, no doubt, scandalized many of the Reformers and prejudiced them against receiving any thing that the Anabaptists held.

† This system, says Mr. Faber, defines Regeneration to be simply "A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION: and under that aspect, determines it to be *inseparably* connected with Baptism. But it insists not upon any such necessary and inseparable connection with Baptism, in regard to that MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, which it would contradistinctively denominate *Conversion* or *Renovation*." *Faber's Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration*, p. 14. As to this, I simply ask what would St. Paul have thought if any one had said to him that a person might be "*regenerate*" and "*brought into a new federal relation to God*," and yet he might neither be "converted" nor "renewed." He might be at the same moment "regenerate," and "dead in trespasses and sins"—"a child of wrath," and yet brought into a *federal* relation to God! This surely is doctrine that the Scripture knows nothing of. Is the Church of God indeed always to vacillate between such evil doctrine as this and the falsehood of Baptismal Regeneration?

Digitized by Google

fore we were buried with him by baptism into death," etc. (Rom. vi. 3.) And again, "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye were raised with him, through faith in the operation of God that raised him from the dead." (Col. ii. 12.) Do these and such like texts teach us to regard Baptism as nothing more than a mere rite of admission into the visible Church? To take from REGENERATION its Scriptural meaning, and to speak of it (or of Baptism its sign) as if it indicated mere initiation into the visible Church, is an offence against the Truth that cannot be too earnestly deprecated.

All who advocate the baptism of infants seem misled by a supposed parallelism between circumcised Israel, and the present baptized body of believers in Jesus. That there is an analogy between circumcision and Baptism is true.* But because there is a resemblance between the relation in which Circumcision stands to *its* covenant, and that in which Baptism stands to the New Covenant (both being rites of initiation) we are not, on account of this resemblance, to ignore every point of difference. Analogy is not parallelism.

So far from there being parallelism, there is contrast. When God separated Israel to be His earthly people, He assigned to them, as a people, certain outward, national, earthly privileges; reserving to Himself the right of secretly conferring

---

* See Remarks, on p. 49.

Digitized by Google

upon *some* in the body thus outwardly privileged, other blessings which were not earthly or contingent, but spiritual and everlasting. Thus there was an outward body, outwardly circumcised; and there was also, hidden in the midst of this outward body, a true circumcision,—individuals spiritually circumcised. But the *outward* body was that which God had constituted to be the means of teaching the lessons which He designed to teach; and with that body He ostensibly and dispensationally dealt. Israel was avowedly constituted by God as an outwardly privileged body in the earth, membership in which did not involve and was not understood (except by pharisaic and sin-blinded hearts) to involve, inward spiritual relationship to God. They who had no inward spiritual relation to God, might nevertheless rightfully claim to belong to the House of Israel. If they were Abraham's outward seed, they had a rightful title to membership in that House, in its then dispensational condition; and they were not regarded by God as aliens who had "crept in unawares" and assumed a standing to which they had no title. But it was otherwise with those gathered by the Apostles of Christ as "the Household of Faith"—"the church of the living God." *Rightful* membership in that body does imply spiritual relationship to God. All who claim to belong to the visible Church profess (whether falsely or not) to have an inward spiritual relationship to God. In receiving circumcision there was no such profession.

Digitized by Google

The parallelism therefore between circumcision and Baptism utterly fails. In receiving circumcision there *is not*, but in receiving Baptism there *is*, the profession of possessing an inward, spiritual, and everlasting relationship to God.

It is true indeed that to Abraham *personally*, circumcision was given as a seal of that righteousness of faith which was found in him: in virtue of which faith he had a spiritual and everlasting relationship to God. It is also true, that, in the secret purpose of God, circumcision was a sign that both Abraham, and all amongst his descendants who had like faith with Abraham, should inherit blessings above the heavens—blessings in due time to be secured by the death and resurrection of Jesus. But we are not now speaking of this. We are speaking of the ostensible and dispensational use of circumcision in relation to Israel as a body: and can any thing be more evident than that from Abraham to Moses, and from Moses to Christ, circumcision was (and that by God's definite appointment—see Gen. xvii.) administered to Abraham's natural descendants, *as such*, even although they neither had, nor were about to have, his faith. "EVERY man-child among you shall be circumcised." It was given to Abraham's children *for Abraham's sake;* not as a sign that they had Abraham's faith (for the majority of them had not) but as a sign and seal that they were and should be God's earthly people—that He would bear to them, as a nation, a relation which He would bear

Digitized by Google

to no other nation on the earth,* and that He would finally establish them in Canaan as their possession. His words to Abraham when He appointed circumcision are these—"I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." (Gen. xvii. 7.) Circumcision was a sign and a seal of this *national* covenant with Israel: and it was this (and not its other more important but secret reference to the few in the midst of Israel who were spiritually children of Abraham) that determined its dispensational use both before and after the Law. Are believers now nationally separated like Israel? We know they are not. What then becomes of the supposed parallelism on which so many arguments have been founded? Circumcision too, being the sign of a separation marked by certain national and political characteristics which were outward and consequently recognised by all, was a sign visibly imprinted on the person of the recipient. "My covenant," saith God, "shall be in your flesh"; in which respect also it differs from Baptism—

* This peculiar relation of God to Israel is marked even now, during the time of their rejection—"You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities." (Amos. iii. 2.) The peculiarity of their punishment is to be a proof of their peculiar relation to God.

Digitized by Google

Baptism being a sign that leaves no outward memorial discernible by the eye of man, because it pertains to those who are associated with One unseen and hidden, His life having been taken from the earth: their separation being moral and spiritual: their inheritance unseen and unearthly: and they themselves strangers whom the world knoweth not. When circumcised Israel shall at last attain their covenanted separation in the earth, all shall know them and recognise them as a people whom the Lord hath blessed. "Their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the peoples: all that see them shall acknowledge them that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed." (Is. lxi. 9.)

It has been frequently said that circumcision was a type of Baptism, and that Baptism was intended to succeed to and supplant circumcision. If so, why was Timothy circumcised? And why were the myriads of Jewish converts who constituted the "Churches of the circumcision," circumcised as well as baptized? Baptism in their case did not supplant circumcision. And why not? To show that God's covenant with Israel as to the Land and all their special national blessings is not abrogated. What could be more important than for the Apostles thus to show to Israel that their doctrine did not subvert what the Prophets had taught—that it did not ignore the covenanted blessings of Israel in the latter days? If circumcision, like Baptism, had reference

Digitized by Google

only to spiritual blessings, they would not have both been administered. The fact that, until Jerusalem fell, both were administered to the Churches of the circumcision,* but Baptism only to the Gentile Churches, proves that circumcision included within the scope of its reference certain blessings which Baptism did not; and that those blessings were the blessings covenanted to Israel as a nation. It shows also, how, in the dispensational use of circumcision, the thought of national not individual privilege, predominates. The Jewish Churches found, in their baptism, the sign and seal of their individual spiritual blessings: in circumcision, the sign and seal of the covenanted blessings of their nation. In Israel then, we find an earthly nation, inheriting from an earthly progenitor, certain national privileges to which natural birth alone gives a valid title. In the present family of faith, we find a body that has no such earthly progenitor, that inherits therefore no such national blessings—that receives no privilege on the ground of natural descent—all its blessings being spiritual, and the link that unites it with its Heavenly Head, being spiritual only. Surely it would be a strange thing to seek parallelism in cir-

* When the "Churches of the circumcision" ceased to be distinctively gathered, with the Church in Jerusalem as their metropolitan centre, and the dispensation became characteristically Gentile (which was the case as soon as Jerusalem fell and the testimony to Christ had been finally rejected there), then, circumcision appears to have been no longer administered to Jewish converts.

Digitized by Google

cumstances so contrasted. We might as well say that the old covenant and the new are identical.

It is indeed by some intimated, rather than asserted, that saintship in the family of faith is hereditary: and that all the children of believers are by birth heirs of salvation.* But will any Christian parents put their finger on any one passage in the New Testament, or on any passage that is not millennial, and say, "In that passage, God has pledged to me His faithfulness that all my children shall be born heirs of everlasting life?" Did St. Paul express his conviction respecting the spiritual

---

* Thus the Helvetian Confession says—"We baptize our children with this holy washing, because it would be unjust to deprive those of the communion of the people of God, who are born of us, His people: who are destined to it by the voice of God: *and who, we may presume are persons elected of God.*" To this it may be answered first, that baptized infants are excluded from the communion of the people of God, for they are not admitted to the Lord's table: secondly, the Scripture does not authorize us to assume that the children of believers are, as such, elected of God: thirdly, if we certainly knew that they were elect, we should not be justified in baptizing them until they were themselves able to return "the answer of a good conscience unto God."

By some, Acts ii. 38, 39, is quoted in proof that all the children of believers are saints. "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." This is certainly a strange passage to adduce: for there are few which prove more clearly that the promise of remission of sins and of the gift of the Holy Ghost is limited to those who, being called, have repentance and faith. Will anyone indeed assert that God hath, in this passage, pledged Himself to give the gift of the Holy Ghost to every child of every believer?

Digitized by Google

condition of Timothy, simply on the ground that he was descended from Lois and from Eunice, or because he saw in him personally the tokens of living faith? Is any sight more sorrowfully frequent than to see believers mourning over the unbelief and unregeneracy of their children who live and who die strangers to God and to His Truth? Would this be possible if God had declared that all the children of believers were necessarily saints?

Other, however, and far different ground than this is commonly taken by those, who, rejecting the Romanist and Anglican doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, do, nevertheless, adhere to the practice of baptizing infants. It is argued, that as in the case of Israel, so in gathering the present family of faith, God avowedly designed to constitute an outward body linked to Him merely by external ordinances, and endowed with certain outward privileges—He reserving to Himself the title to bring into vital union with Himself, some, secretly known to Himself, in the midst of the outward body.

Now if it were true that the Church was, by God's commandment, constituted, like Israel, as a body that had certain national or outward blessings, the possession of which involved no spiritual relationship to God, then surely, God, if He had appointed Baptism at all, would in appointing it, have adhered to the same method that He had adopted in appointing circumcision. He would have accurately defined the *outward* privileges,

national or otherwise, which, all born into the outward body were to possess, and would have declared Baptism to be the sign of such outward blessings; reserving to Himself the right of making it a sign of other spiritual and everlasting blessings to those whom He might secretly bring into vital union with Christ. But He has not done this. He has not used "*Regeneration*" as the name, nor Baptism as the sign, of any mere outward or earthly condition of privilege. He has *never* used Regeneration in any lower sense than the being quickened with new, heavenly, and everlasting life, in and through Christ Jesus. He has *never* used Baptism but as the sign of spiritual and everlasting union with Christ. Will then, indeed, any one venture to affirm that God, after having affixed this one solemn meaning to "*Regeneration*," and to *Baptism* as its sign, did then command that this term, and this sign, should be applied to persons who were either known to have no spiritual relationship to God, or else afforded no evidence of their having any?

God did *not* command that a mere professing body should be constituted as His Church. He has indeed permitted it, but He never commanded or authorized it. On the contrary, He speaks of it as disobedience and sin. In prophetically describing the Church's history, He forewarned us that partly through the craft of Satan, partly through the negligence of His servants, especially in neglecting the appointed discipline, and partly through the pre-

sumptuous daring of those who should intrude themselves amongst His people, "creeping in unawares," there would be constituted a *mere* professing body, which, seeing that it would not continue in His goodness, would finally be cut off. He has told us that such a mere professing body would be constituted, but, I repeat, He never authorized its formation. He has not appointed one ground of entrance into the visible Church and another ground of entrance into the real Church. He has made faith in the blood of Jesus, and the consequent possession of His Spirit, needful to a rightful title to admission even into the *visible* Church: and if that name be falsely professed, and faith in His saving blood and the possession of His Spirit be feigned, the responsibility rests not with Him. False profession must needs be generated, if sacramental ordinances, instead of personal faith, be made the link that unites to Christ: or if His sacrifice on Calvary be nullified by assigning salvation partly to it, partly to the supposed mediatorial office of the Church, or indeed to any thing else connected with ourselves. They who thus speak of Christ, deny Christ as revealed in the Scriptures of Truth. It is with far other thoughts, that the poor needy soul that discerns itself to be lost, turns for refuge to the blood and righteousness of Jesus, and says in faith—"Thou art the Christ. To whom else should we go?" Such a confession as this, is a confession "unto salvation"; and they who make it, belong to

the Church of the living God: but they who make it not—they who seek to enter in any other way, have no authority from God to profess themselves as belonging to His Church, even as a visible communion here.

It is very obvious that all who teach that Baptism justifies and quickens—with a justification, however, and a life that is lost almost as soon as given, must, in conformity with their system, assert that God in calling forth His Church to be His witness—"the pillar and ground of His Truth," commanded that it should be constituted as a mere professing body—a body so far assisted by grace as to attain temporary baptismal justification, but afterwards having to save itself by its own obedience. But it must also be remembered, that many who reject this doctrine (a doctrine which, if an angel from heaven had taught it, St. Paul would have pronounced him "accursed,") are nevertheless, obliged by their system to maintain, that God in constituting His Church, avowedly designed to constitute it as a mere professing body. They are obliged to maintain this, if they assert that Baptism is intended by God merely as a rite of introduction into the visible Church, and that it is rightly conferred on those who are not spiritually united to Christ. But surely it is a solemn thing to impute to God and to His commandment, results that have flowed from the carelessness, and failure, and presumption of man. It is a solemn thing thus to misrepresent His ways. It is a solemn thing also

to explain away the meaning of an ordinance so important, and so carefully defined as Baptism, and to give a new and unscriptural meaning to a term so momentous and so definite as Regeneration.

It must be remembered too, that they who maintain that the visible Church was originally designed to be a mere professing body, are always in danger of rendering to it, even in periods of its worst corruption, a respect and homage which the Word of God forbids. Thus, even Calvin was betrayed into advising Christian parents, when prevented by circumstances from having their children rightly baptized, to take them for baptism to the Priests of Rome. "To deprive children of baptism on account of popish abuses, or even because it could not be had without them, he thought even a greater fault than presenting them to baptism under all these disadvantages."*

All these things are pitfalls—deadly snares of Satan: and there is one only way of avoiding

* For a sad account of Calvin's sentiments on this subject, see Scott's Hist. of Church of Christ, Vol. iii. p. 400. It should further be observed, that they who define regeneration to be a being born into the visible Church, are obliged to say that wicked men, if baptized, are born again. Thus we find Augustine saying of Simon Magus—"Etenim Simonem Magum per Baptismum, ipsa (scil. Ecclesia) PEPERERAT: cui tamen dictum est, quod non haberet partem in hereditate Christi. Nunquid ei baptismus, nunquid evangelium, nunquid sacramenta defuerunt? Sed, quia ei charitas defuit, FRUSTRA NATUS EST. *Aug. de Bapt. contra Donat.*, lib. i. c. 10. This, I repeat, is a sense of "regeneration" unknown to the Scripture. The sin of thus tampering with the words of God cannot be too strongly denounced.

Digitized by Google

them; even by adhering closely to the Scripture as our alone authoritative rule: by remembering that Baptism is nothing less than the sign of the union of all believers in death and resurrection, with their now glorified Head—and by administering it only to those who are able to return "THE ANSWER OF A GOOD CONSCIENCE UNTO GOD."

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX H.

On Faber's "Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration."

I HAVE already observed that there is no distinct mention of Infant-baptism in the works of the early ecclesiastical writers until it is referred to, disapprovingly, by Tertullian, in the beginning of the fourth century. This is admitted, by not a few of the advocates of Infant-baptism. Many, however, dispute it. It may be well, therefore, to glance at the passages which they are accustomed to cite. I take them from a chapter entitled "Antiquity of Infant-Baptism," in a work by Mr. Faber.*

Mr. Faber begins by admitting, that in the Fathers called "Apostolical," as having been contemporaries of the Apostles (viz., Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp), "nothing, or at least nothing *literally* explicit," is found respecting the Baptism of Infants.

"But," continues Mr. Faber, "in the next eccle-
"siastical succession, Justin Martyr has stated a
"circumstance which imports, both that Infant-
"baptism was used in the Primitive Church, and

* See Faber's "Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration," p. 228.

Digitized by Google

"likewise that it had begun to be used (precisely as "we might infer from Scripture) in the Apostolic age "itself."

The words of Justin Martyr are: "Many men and "many women who have attained to the term of "sixty or of seventy years, and who have been made "disciples to Christ from their very childhood, re-"main, &c.—*οἱ ἐκ παιδων ἐμαθητευθησαν τῳ Χριστῳ.* It will probably be asked where Mr. Faber finds his proof of Infant-baptism in this passage. He finds it in the words "have been made disciples," (*ἐμαθητευθησαν*), for he argues none would be considered by Justin to be disciples who were not also baptized. This no doubt is true: but it is also true that Justin would not have regarded any as rightly baptized who had not first been "discipled." Justin is not speaking in this passage of persons who had been baptized *from infancy* (*ἐκ νηπιων*), but of persons *who had been discipled from childhood* (*ἐκ παιδων*) —a very different thought. No one denies that children may be *discipled* and baptized at a very early age: but the question is, whether unconscious infants can be "discipled" and baptized. To meet the views of Mr. Faber, Justin should have written—"who were baptized from infancy," *οἱ ἐκ νηπιων ἐβαπτισθησαν.* But he has *not* written this. The passage, therefore, may be quoted in proof, that children were not regarded as belonging to Christ, until they had been "*discipled.*"

Mr. Faber's next witness is Irenæus, "who during

Digitized by Google

"a considerable part of his life was the contem-
"porary of Justin; and who, from his migration out
"of Asia into Gaul, was familiarly acquainted with
"the practice of the Church, both in the East, and
"in the West."

The passage cited from Irenæus is as follows:
"*Our Lord came to save all through Himself;* all, that
"is, who through Him are born again unto God—
"*infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and adults.*
"*Therefore, He passed through every age: among in-*
"*fants, being made an infant,* thus sanctifying infants:
"*among children, being made a child, thus sanctifying*
"*children; and at the same time, becoming to them an*
"*example of piety and righteousness and subjection:*
"*among youths, being made a youth, thus becoming an*
"*example to youths, and sanctifying them to the Lord:*
"*finally, among adults, being made an adult, that among*
"*all He might be a perfect Master.*" Irenæus Adv. Hæres., lib. ii., c. 39.

It will probably be again asked, where Mr. Faber finds the proof of Infant-baptism in this passage. He finds it in the words "*who through Him were born again unto God*"; and in the words "*thus sanctifying infants.*" But to say that "sanctifying" means Baptism in this passage, overthrows the very doctrine that Irenæus designs to teach. His statement is, that Christ sanctified infants by passing through the age of infancy—a very absurd and false statement, it is true: but still such is his doctrine. Now it is very obvious that if Irenæus believed that

Digitized by Google

Christ sanctified infants by the fact of becoming Himself an infant, he did not believe that Christ sanctified them by Baptism. And how can we alter into nonsense the words, "who through Him are born again unto God"—for it would be nonsense to say, "who through Him are baptized unto God"? The words "by" or "through Him" (per eum) evidently mean by His personal instrumentality. It is very evident that Irenæus is neither speaking nor thinking of Baptism in this passage. His subject is not Baptism, but something altogether different from Baptism. Moreover, if he had used these words respecting Baptism, he would have taught what he did not believe, viz., that no unbaptized infants could be saved.*

---

* Lest I should be supposed to misrepresent Mr. Faber, I will quote his exact words: "In this passage, the Sacrament of Baptism "is not precisely mentioned: but it is clearly implied: both in the "expression '*born again*,' and in the term '*sanctifying*.' For as we "learned from Justin, Baptism was deemed the ordinary and official "channel of Regeneration: and Personal Sanctification was held to "be its special characteristic and result. Now *all*, we see, from "infants and children to youths and adults, were believed to be "born again, in the Church, through Christ unto God. Therefore "*all*, whether infants or children, or youths or adults, must have "been alike required to receive Baptism as the mean and sign of "Regeneration."

It is obvious that all who argue thus, believe that to allow that an infant needs, and *may* receive Regeneration in Christ, is equivalent to saying that they are fit recipients of Baptism. But it is not so. It cannot be too often repeated, that although all infants need regeneration, and although we know that all infants who die in irresponsible infancy are regenerated in Christ, yet none are meet to receive Baptism until they can themselves return "the answer of a good conscience unto God." See remarks on pages 57, 58.

Google

Mr. Faber next quotes Tertullian. As the passage has been already cited (see p. 54) I will not repeat it. Mr. Faber very truly remarks that the opposition of Tertullian to Infant-baptism proves that it was practised. That, certainly, no one can doubt: but it is rather unfortunate for Mr. Faber's theory, that the first explicit reference to Infant-baptism should be found in the writing of an objector.

Mr. Faber next goes back to Clement of Rome, in whose epistle he finds one passage in which "the practice of Infant-baptism is *insinuated*, though not specifically *mentioned*." The insinuation is contained in the following citation made by Clement from the book of Job—"No one is pure from sinful corruption, though his age may not exceed a single day."

I think few would have marvelled more than Clement himself, at being suspected of such an "*insinuation*." Any who could be influenced by such an insinuation, must be too easily influenced to be worth influencing. This citation from Clement is the last that Mr. Faber makes.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX J.

On the SEAL of the Holy Spirit.

It has frequently been said in the preceding pages, that Baptism is to be regarded as a *seal*, on the part of God, of the blessings of which it is the sign or symbol. The word "seal," thus employed, is used in that sense of *formal* ratification which we attach to it, when we speak of a deed of gift, or of a testament, receiving in confirmation the seal of its author. It is a formal act of ratification, intended to give full legal validity to that which is thus confirmed.

Some have objected to the use of this word, lest it should be understood to imply that the faithfulness of God is pledged to those, who receive Baptism *wrongfully*. But no promise or pledge fraudulently obtained, is binding. If the ministers of a human sovereign use the royal seal disobediently, or if its authority be obtained fraudulently, the sovereign is not bound by its misuse.

It has also been said, that we must beware of exalting Baptism, or any other outward ordinance, into too high a place; and that if we say that Baptism is to be regarded as "a seal," appointed of God,

Digitized by Google

there is danger of its being supposed that the promise of God is invalid without it; and thus Baptism would be made indispensably necessary to salvation. To this we reply, that *formal* ratification may be, even in human arrangements, dispensed with. Oftentimes men have acknowledged bonds that have not been formally sealed and ratified. We never exalt the seal into parity with the resolve of the promiser, nor even into equality with the deed that it attests. The great Legislator hath said, "he that believeth not shall be damned": but He hath not said, "he that is not baptized shall be damned." Outward ordinances, however important, are not to be classed with those moral and spiritual qualifications that cannot be dispensed with.

It is true, indeed, that as regards the order of the visible Church on earth, those ordinances by which that order is maintained are of the deepest moment. Nor can it be doubted that whilst the Apostles lived, none would have been received into the communion of the Church, except they had been baptized. Even after Cornelius and those with him had openly received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, they were baptized with water in the name of the Lord Jesus. It is equally evident, that, in the Apostolic Church, there was only one form of Baptism—no disputes respecting either the form, or the subjects of Baptism being known. To have rejected the infallible authority of the Apostles of Christ, would have been a sin that would, in itself, have excluded from communion

Digitized by Google

with the Church. There was no room for questioning on subjects which infallible authority was present to decide: and there were then those who could say, "it seemeth good to the Holy Ghost, and to us." None could truthfully assert that they doubted respecting the meaning of a commandment, when the Apostles were present to explain and to enforce their own inspired precepts.

But it is far otherwise now. The visible Church, as soon as the Apostles died, ceased to be "the pillar and ground of the truth"; and soon became the witness of error, as the present condition of Christendom abundantly testifies. Can we wonder then, that many even among the true servants of Christ, should be honestly perplexed on such a subject as Infant-baptism? Can we wonder that many should have settled down, from childhood, into the firm conviction that Infant-baptism is appointed of God? I do not say that it ought so to be. I do not say that the clear light of Scripture, if simply appealed to, is not abundantly sufficient to dispel every cloud. It *is* sufficient. Ignorance therefore is sin—a sin which infinite grace alone can pardon. That such ignorance, however, does exist, is a fact for which they who remember the craft of Satan and the deceivableness of the human heart, will not find it difficult to account. Is it not, however, equally a fact, that many whom we certainly know, from the word of God, to have formed wrong conclusions as to Infant-baptism, are nevertheless markedly owned

Digitized by Google

of God as His servants? Has not Christ employed and honoured many such? and are we, because of an outward ordinance, to cast out of the visible Church those whom He not only recognises, but honours in it? It is ill for us to act in judgment where Christ acts in grace—especially at a period when, because of weakness and of failure, we all need the very fullest extent of His long-suffering mercy. Hezekiah felt not so, when, seeing that many whom he had summoned to keep the long-neglected Passover, were unprepared, he prayed for them and said, "The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary." It is true, indeed, that we are not to compromise Truth: but it is very possible, whilst we maintain the practical position which conscience and Truth require, and beware of giving even an indirect sanction to practices which we discern to be wrong, to avoid also the sin of rejecting from the Table of the Lord those whom the Lord has not rejected, but receives. Sins which, if persevered in, exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven, are the only right subjects for the excommunicative discipline of the Church. A plain and full ministration of Scripture Truth is the means by which Pastors may best fence the fold around. If that be done—if the sheep be "girt about with Truth," the need will not be felt for raising unauthorized, and therefore sinful, barriers.

Digitized by Google

Much perplexity has also existed in the minds of many, as to the relation in which Baptism stands to the gift of the Holy Spirit. In considering this subject, it is needful to distinguish, very carefully, between the gift of the Holy Ghost as the Spirit of Promise, the Comforter, and the act of that Spirit in quickening the soul by creating in believers "the new man," at the moment they first look in faith to Jesus.

The first act of the Spirit of God in believers, in every dispensation, has been to open their hearts to receive the things spoken of God respecting Christ. Before Christ came, the testimony of God was to Him as promised: when He came, to Him as come: now, to Him as having come, as having made atonement by death for the sins of all those who reject Him not, and as having ascended into glory. Whenever the hearts of any have been opened to receive God's testimony, and to look in faith to Christ, whether promised or come, they were at that moment quickened. This was the case with all under the Old Testament who died before Baptism was appointed; it was the case with the disciples during our Lord's life on earth; and it has been the case with all who have lived since Baptism was instituted. Life was received by faith in God through Christ, in some cases before Baptism was heard of: in every case before Baptism was administered. There is not one of whom we read in the Acts who was not quickened by the Spirit, and therefore born of God,

Digitized by Google

before he received Baptism at all. Therefore, they could not have been quickened in Baptism. Baptism was to them the sign and the seal of a righteousness and life which they had, yet being unbaptized.

This act, however, of the Spirit in quickening, is not the same as His coming as the Comforter, the Spirit of promise, to dwell in those whom He hath quickened. Since Pentecost, they who have been previously quickened by the Spirit through faith in Jesus, receive also the indwelling power of that Spirit, as an attestation on the part of God to the ascended glory of Jesus. This Baptism of the Holy Spirit has been, by many, supposed to be so essentially connected with Baptism by water, as not to be received apart therefrom:—a doctrine which has received apparent confirmation from our finding in the Acts certain cases in which the Baptism of the Spirit was not, as now, given secretly, without any circumstances of outward manifestation, at the moment when the soul is first quickened through faith in Jesus. On the contrary, we find certain specific instances in which the Spirit was either given manifestly, as in the case of Cornelius; or else, an interval was allowed to elapse (as in the case of Paul) between the being quickened and the receiving of the Spirit as the Comforter: and then it was given *after* the formal administration of Baptism, or of laying on of hands.

The cases in which the Holy Ghost was given in

this peculiar manner were: first, when some out of Israel on whom the guilt of shedding the blood of Jesus rested, repented and were received: secondly, when the Samaritans who stood contrasted in a certain way, both with Jews and Gentiles, were received: thirdly, when Saul, after having rejected not merely Jesus, but also the testimony which the Holy Ghost gave by the mouth of the servants of Jesus, repented and was received: fourthly, when the Gentiles were received: fifthly, when some disciples of John, who had only heard of John's Baptism, were received.

It is obvious that under one or other of these classes all mankind fall: lest therefore, the narrowness of the human heart should object to the admission of some of these classes into the Church of God, God was pleased, when the first individuals out of these classes were admitted, to bestow on them His Spirit in a special and peculiar manner, thereby attesting the propriety of the act of His servants in baptizing with water those whom they had thus received into communion with the saved. But after the right of these various classes to the grace of the gospel had been thus attested by God, we do not read of any such peculiar mode of attestation again. On the contrary, in the epistle to the Ephesians we are expressly taught that the moment of believing is not only the moment of our being quickened, but that it is also the moment of our receiving the indwelling presence of the Holy Ghost as

Digitized by Google

the seal whereby God marks us as His, and as the pledge or earnest of the future inheritance in glory. "In whom having believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance," etc.* St. Paul, let it be observed, does not say in this passage, "on being baptized ye were sealed," but "on believing ye were sealed." This order will not be departed from by God until the next dispensation commences, when the remnant of Israel who shall be forgiven by the Lord at His return, will some time after their forgiveness receive that second and last outpouring of the Holy Ghost of which the Prophets speak. At present, believers are quickened and receive the indwelling of the Holy Spirit at the same moment.

---

* Observe the words in the original—ἐν ᾧ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε. The participle thus used in the same tense as the finite verb, marks coincidence, or else connection, of time—just such as we may see in the united links of a chain. "If," says Matthiæ, "the participle denotes an action coinciding in time with that of the finite verb, and completed along with it, the participle is in the same tense." See Matthiæ Greek Grammar, § 559. "After ye believed," is therefore an objectionable translation in this passage. A similar correction is needed in Acts xix. St. Paul's question was on *the supposition* that they had heard of Jesus. "Did ye, when ye believed, receive the Holy Ghost?" On receiving the answer to this question, he found that they had not yet believed in Jesus, but had only heard of John's testimony. "Then he spake to them of Jesus." They were not disciples of Jesus, but of John, when St. Paul found them.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX K.

On Corrupt Practices introduced into the Early Church, and those observed by the Church of Rome.

It may be observed with respect to the letter of Augustine mentioned above, that it is not certainly known who the Boniface was that had addressed to Augustine these enquiries. Boniface's letter is only known to us through Augustine's reply. That he was a bishop is stated by Augustine: of what place does not certainly appear. That Boniface was rather apprehensive that he would not receive a satisfactory reply from Augustine, would appear from his request that Augustine would not, as he was wont, write him merely a letter of prescription, but that he would favour him with his reasons for what he mantained. (Ad istas ergo quæstiones peto breviter respondere digneris, ita ut non mihi de consuetudine præscribas, sed rationem reddas). One of Boniface's questions was, whether if the will of the Christian parent determined that of his child, it was to be held also that the will of the heathen parent when dedicating his child to a demon, determined the will and condition of that

Google

child? Augustine's answer is, as usual, diffuse and most unsatisfactory—its substance* being, that the will of the Christian parent and of his child is one, by virtue of the power of one Spirit: a unity to which, in the other case there is no parallel. This answer of course implies that the Holy Spirit is given to infants *before* Baptism, and therefore cannot be given in Baptism. Yet this is virtually contradicted by another passage where he says, "therefore, although that faith which is connected with the will of believers does not as yet constitute the babe a believer, yet the sacrament of faith itself does so constitute him. For as it is answered that he believes, so he is called a believer, not by rendering assent by an actual operation of the mind, but by perceiving the sacrament of the thing." Alas! how long shall we give heed to these vanities.

* Augustine's words are these—Ut autem possit regenerari per officium voluntatis alienæ cum offertur consecrandus, facit hoc unus Spiritus, ex quo regeneratur oblatus. Non enim scriptum est: nisi quis renatus fuerit ex parentum voluntate aut ex offerentium vel ministrantium fide; sed nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ et Spiritu sancto. Aqua igitur exhibens forinsecus sacramentum gratiæ, et spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiæ, solvens vinculum culpæ, reconcilians bonum naturæ, regenerant hominem in uno Christo ex uno Adamo generatum. Regenerans ergo Spiritus in majoribus offerentibus et parvulo oblato renatoque communis est: ideo per hanc societatem unius ejusdemque spiritus prodest offerentium voluntas parvulo oblato. Quando autem in parvulum majores peccant, offerentes eum atque obligare conantes dæmonum sacrilegis vinculis, non est anima utrorumque communis, ut etiam culpam possint habere communem. Non enim sic communicatur culpa per alterius voluntatem quemadmodum communicatur gratia per Sancti Spiritus unitatem.

Digitized by Google

Seeing then we cannot unite with those who say that all the children of believers are quickened by the Spirit and therefore may be baptized, either without "the answer of a good conscience unto God," or with that answer returned by sponsors: and secondly, since we cannot unite with those who say that all infants are regenerated *in the act of Baptism*, in which case the answer of the sponsors who say that the infant believes should be returned *after*, and *not before* the act of Baptism: and thirdly, since we cannot unite with those who say that Baptism is a mere act of dedication or admission into the visible Church, and that it does not signify that the recipient is born again in Christ, and further that "the answer of a good conscience unto God," may be altogether dispensed with—seeing we cannot unite with any of these statements, it remains that we can only administer Baptism to such, whether young or old, who are able to discern what guilt is, and what the refuge is in the blood of the Lamb. Such are regenerate, and may fitly receive the sign of regeneration. They have died and risen in Christ. They are also able to return "the answer of a good conscience unto God."

It may be desirable, in further proof of the corruption that was introduced after the Apostles died, to notice that even so early as the time of Justin Martyr, there prevailed a practice of adding water to the wine in the Lord's Supper. Justin Martyr says when describing the manner in which they

Digitized by Google

partook of the Lord's Supper, "then, to the President of the Brethren, there is brought bread along with a cup of water and mingled wine:* (*αρτος και ποτηριον ὑδατος και κραματος*) and he, having received them, offers up praise and glory, to the Father of all things, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; and he abundantly makes a thanksgiving, moreover, that, on the part of God, we should have been deemed worthy of these things. And, when he had finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present assent by uttering the word Amen. And then certain persons, whom we call Deacons, give, to each one present, a portion of the bread and wine and water, over which thanksgiving has been offered up, that he may be a partaker: and they carry some to those who are absent."

---

* The Church of Rome continues this practice of mingling water with the wine, and explains it thus: "the word water we also find used in the Apocalypse to signify the people, and therefore water mixed with wine signifies the union of the faithful with Christ as their head . . . Care must be taken not only to mingle water with the wine, but also to mingle it in small quantity; for in the opinion of ecclesiastical writers, the water is changed into wine." Catech. of Trent, II. iv. 16.

Any absurdity satisfies Rome, if only she can thereby hide the saving power of the blood of the Lamb. Seeing that the child is taught to demand *of the Church* eternal life (see p. 142) it must by all means be concealed that "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ." Rome knows that if men find in Christ eternal life, they would cease to seek it of *her*, and then her honour would perish. Nothing but the immediate and distinct power of the devil could ever lead men to constitute themselves saviours to others, and in order to effect this end to hide the salvation of God.

Digitized by Google

This was indeed a daring innovation on the institution of the Lord, who so clearly marks the cup as containing the "fruit of the vine"—an emblem of the joy that pertains to the forgiven sinner through the redemption that is in His blood. But when the doctrines of grace were nullified, as they were in Justin's time, by false additions, it was well, perhaps, that they should have attested their disobedience by a further act of disobedience in thus altering the symbol. But are these the persons we are to take for our guides instead of the Apostles? "Beloved," said the Apostle Peter, when speaking of the corruption that should prevail in the professing Church, "Be mindful," not of later teachers, but "of the commandment of US the apostles of the Lord and Saviour."

When Infant-baptism was established, we find also the simplicity of its administration destroyed, and the superstitious practice introduced of administering the Lord's Supper to infants—a practice, however, which seems an almost necessary consequence of receiving infants into the communion of the Church.

Dr. Hook, speaking of the practice of the early Church, observes, "The persons baptized were either infants or adults. To prove that infants were admitted to the sacrament of baptism we need only use this argument. None were admitted to the eucharist until they had received baptism: but in the primitive church, children received the sacra-

Digitized by Google

ment of the Lord's Supper, as appears in what Cyprian relates concerning a sucking child, who so violently refused to taste the sacramental wine, that the deacon was obliged forcibly to open her lips and pour it down her throat. Origen writes: that children are baptized, 'for the purging away of the natural filth and original impurity inherent in them.' We might add the testimonies of Irenæus * and Cyprian; but it will be sufficient to mention the determination of an African synod, held A.D. 254.

"The person to be baptized, if an adult, was first examined by the bishop, or officiating priest, who put some questions to him; as, first, whether he abjured the devil and all his works; secondly, whether he gave a firm assent to all the articles of the Christian faith: to both which he answered in the affirmative. . . . If the person to be baptized was an infant, these interrogatories were answered by his *sponsores*, or godfathers. Whether the use of sponsors was as old as the apostles' days is uncercertain; perhaps it was not, since Justin Martyr, speaking of the method and form of baptism, says not a word of them. †

* The times of Origen, Cyprian, and the African council of A.D. 254, are somewhat late *primitive* antiquity. As to Irenæus, he does not teach Infant-baptism: the passage quoted from him, if really his, gives us no very high opinion of his wisdom, but it is certainly against, rather than for Infant-baptism. See p. 123.

† In candour, Dr. Hook and others should state that Justin Martyr is decidedly a witness against Infant-baptism, for when expressly describing the mode and circumstances of baptism, not only does

Google

"After the questions and answers, followed *exorcism*, the manner and end of which was this. The minister laid his hands on the person's head, and breathed in his face, implying thereby the driving away, or expelling, of the devil from him, and preparing him for baptism, by which the good and holy Spirit was to be conferred on him.

"After exorcism followed baptism itself: and first the minister, by prayer, consecrated the water for that use. Tertullian says, 'any waters may be applied to that use; but then God must be first invocated; and then the Holy Ghost presently comes down from heaven, and moves upon them, and sanctifies them.' The water being consecrated, the person was baptized 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;' by which 'dedication of him to the blessed Trinity, the person' (says Clemens Alexandrinus) 'is delivered from the corrupt trinity, the devil, the world, and the flesh.'

"In performing the ceremony of baptism, the usual custom was to immerse and dip the whole body. Thus St. Barnabas, describing a baptized person, says, 'We go down into the water full of

---

he make no mention of infants, but he writes as follows respecting those who were deemed suitable for baptism. "Whosoever shall have been persuaded, and shall believe the truth of the matters which by us are taught and propounded, and shall promise that they will live accordingly: these persons are instructed to supplicate God with fasting that their former sins may be forgiven: we ourselves jointly praying and fasting along with them. THEN they are brought by us to a place where there is water." &c., &c.

Digitized by Google

sin and filth, but we ascend bearing fruit in our hearts.' . . .

"Then followed the unction, by which (says St. Cyril) was signified that they were now cut off from the wild olive, and were ingrafted into Christ, the true olive-tree; or else to show that they were now to be champions for the gospel, and were anointed thereto, as the old Athletæ were against their solemn games. With this anointing was joined the sign of the cross, made upon the forehead of the person baptized; which being done, he had a white garment given him, to denote his being washed from the defilements of sin, or in allusion to the words of the apostle, 'as many as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ.' From this custom some suppose that the feast of Pentecost, which was one of the annual seasons of baptism, came to be called Whit-sunday, *i.e.*, White-sunday. But this is probably not the true derivation." *See Dr. Hook's Church Dictionary*, "*Baptism.*"

Compare this with the practice of the Church of Rome, and then say whether Rome has done anything more than decorate the building the Fathers constructed. The following is Rome's own account of her ceremonies.

"In the first place the water to be used in Baptism should be previously prepared: the baptismal water is consecrated with the oil of mystic unction; and this cannot be done at all times, but,

Digitized by Google

according to ancient usage on the vigils of certain festivals. . . . The person to be baptized is brought or conducted to the door of the Church and is forbidden to enter, as unworthy to be admitted into the house of God, until he has cast off the yoke of the most degrading servitude of Satan, devoted himself unreservedly to Christ, and pledged his fidelity to the just sovereignty of the Lord Jesus.

"The priest then asks what he demands of the Church of God;* and having received the answer he first instructs him catechetically in the doctrines of the christian faith of which a profession is to be made in baptism. This practice of thus communicating instruction, originated no doubt in the precept of our Lord addressed to His apostles: 'Go ye into all the world and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you';

* It should, however, be more fully stated what these questions and instructions are. "When a child," says Dr. Hook, "is to be baptized in that Church, the persons who bring it wait for the priest at the door of the Church, who comes thither in his surplice and purple stole attended by his clerks. He begins with questioning the godfathers, whether they promise, in the child's name, to live and die in the true Catholic and Apostolic faith, and what name they would give the child. Then follows an exhortation to the sponsors; after which the priest, calling the child by its name asks it as follows: 'What dost thou demand of the Church?' The godfather answers, 'Eternal life.' The priest goes on: 'If you are desirous of obtaining eternal life, keep God's commandments, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,' &c. After which he breathes three times in the child's face, saying, 'Come out of this child, thou evil spirit, and make room for the Holy Ghost.'"

Digitized by Google

words from which we may learn that baptism is not to be administered, until, at least, the principal truths of religion are explained. But as the catechetical form consists of question and answer; if the person to be instructed be an adult, he himself answers the interrogatories; if an infant, the sponsor answers according to the prescribed form, and enters into a solemn engagement for the child.

"The exorcism comes next in order: it consists of words of sacred and religious import, and of prayers; and is used to expel the devil, to weaken and crush his power. To the exorcism are added other ceremonies, each of which being mystical, has its clear and proper signification. When, for instance, salt is put into the mouth of the person to be baptized, it evidently imports, that by the doctrines of faith, and by the gift of grace, he shall be delivered from the corruption of sin, shall experience a relish for good works, and shall be nurtured with the food of divine wisdom. Again, his forehead, eyes, breast, shoulders, ears, are signed with the sign of the cross, to declare, that by the mystery of baptism, the senses of the person baptized are opened and strengthened, to enable him to receive God, and to understand and observe His commandments. His nostrils and ears are next touched with spittle, and he is then immediately admitted to the baptismal font: by this ceremony we understand that, as sight was given to the blind man, mentioned in the Gospel, whom the Lord, having spread clay

Digitized by Google

on his eyes, commanded to wash them in the waters of Siloe; so by the efficacy of holy baptism, a light is let in on the mind, which enables it to discern heavenly truth.

"After the performances of these ceremonies, the person to be baptized approaches the baptismal font, at which are performed other rites and ceremonies which present a summary of the obligations imposed by the Christian religion. In three distinct interrogatories, he is formally asked by the minister of religion, 'dost thou renounce Satan?' 'all his works?' 'and all his pomps?'—to each of which he, or the sponsor in his name, replies in the affirmative. Whoever, then, purposes to enlist under the standard of Christ, must, first of all, enter into a sacred and solemn engagement to renounce the devil and the world, and, as his worst enemies, to hold them in utter detestation.

"He is next anointed with the oil of catechumens on the breast and between the shoulders—on the breast, that by the gift of the Holy Ghost he may lay aside error and ignorance, and receive the true faith; for 'the just man liveth by faith'—on the shoulders, that by the grace of the Holy Spirit he may be enabled to shake off negligence and torpor, and engage actively in the performance of good works; for 'faith without works is dead.'

"Next, standing at the baptismal font, he is interrogated by the minister of religion in these words: 'Dost thou believe in God, the Father

Digitized by Google

Almighty?' to which is answered, 'I believe'; a like interrogatory is proposed with regard to the other articles of the creed, successively; and thus is made a solemn profession of faith. These two engagements, the renunciation of Satan and all his works and pomps, and the belief of all the articles of the creed, including, as they do, both faith and practice, constitute, it is clear, the whole force and discipline of the law of Christ.

"When baptism is now about to be administered, the priest asks him if he will be baptized; to which an answer in the affirmative being given by him, or, if an infant, by the sponsor, the priest performs the ablution, 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' As man, by yielding the assent of his will to the wicked suggestions of Satan, fell under a just sentence of condemnation; so God will have none enrolled in the number of His soldiers, but those whose service is voluntary; that by a willing obedience to His commands, they may obtain eternal salvation.

"After the person has been baptized, the priest anoints with chrism the crown of his head, thus giving him to understand, that from the moment of his baptism, he is united as a member to Christ, his head, and ingrafted on His body; and that he is, therefore, called a Christian, from Christ, as Christ is so called from Chrism. What the Chrism signifies, the prayers offered by the priest, St. Ambrose observes, sufficiently explain.

Digitized by Google

"On the person baptized the priest then puts a white garment, saying, 'receive this white garment, which mayest thou carry unstained before the judgment-seat of our Lord Jesus Christ; that thou mayest have eternal life. Amen.' Instead of a white garment, infants because not formally dressed, receive a white kerchief, accompanied with the same words. According to the doctrine of the Holy Fathers, this symbol signifies the glory of the resurrection to which we are born by baptism, the brightness and beauty with which the soul, when purified from the stains of sin, is invested, and the innocence and integrity which the person who has received baptism, should preserve through life."

It is sorrowful to think that they who love such things as these, and who would fain lure Protestants back, through the Fathers, into this abyss of ruin, are able to write of the English Prayer Book, as follows: "Neither," says a well known Tractarian, "among the Eastern offices of Baptism, all of which I know well—Constantinopolitan, Coptic Jacobite, Armenian, Syro-Jacobite, Ethiopic, Nestorian, nor to the best of my belief and research amongst those of the West, is there one which so unequivocally asserts the unconditional regeneration of an infant as our own office. In other words, of no other Church under the sun could it be affirmed with such plenitude of certainty, that it asserts

the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration as our own." *Neal's Few Words of Hope*, pp. 6, 7.

Whether Protestantism has sufficiently purged itself from the corruptions of the Fathers, and of the Eastern Churches, and of the Church of Rome, touching Baptism and connected truths, let Protestants who fear God judge.

Digitized by Google

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

f=and following page. *ff*=and following pages. *F*=footnote.

Page.

Antitype 83*f*
Ark (Noah's) typical of Christ 17, 82*ff*
Atonement-money.. 67
Baptism, a confession of faith 9, 45
" age when observed 7
" eucharistic rite 28, 45
" figure of death and resurrection 13, 18
" fit subjects for.. .. .. 36, 120
" ordinance of grace 5*f*, 45
" rite on entrance into communion with God's people 9, 45
" Romish observance of.. .. .. 141*ff*
Believing, a pre-requisite for Baptism 55
Children of Christians 47*f*, 58, 114
" on rearing of .. .. 59, 60 *F*
Christ, Representative in death 9
" " " resurrection glory 12
" the Object of faith 21
Circumcision, analogy between Baptism and 49, 108
" difference " " " 51
" antitypical or spiritual 11
" of Timothy .. .. 52 *F*
" sign of earthly blessings .. .. .. 52 *F*, 113
Conscience, answer of a good 36, 45, 47, 51, 136
Corruption in the Church 36
Covenant of promise 5*f*
Dedication of children 44
Efficacy of the waters 76*f*
Eunuch and Philip 7*f*
Exorcism 140, 143
Faith, justifying 2, 87*ff*
lood, the 15
" " typical 17, 82*ff*
Households, Baptism of 45*f*
Immersion .. .. 13 *F*, 94*ff*, 140*f*
Infant Baptism, its origin 36*ff*, 53, 121
" " antiquity against it 55, 121
Infants and Irresponsibles, salvation of.. 57

Digitized by Google

Justifying faith .. .. 2, 87 *ff*
Laver, the .. .. 66 *ff*
Law *v.* Grace 40-43
Lord's Supper 19
Love of God to man .. .. 62 *f*
Mystery .. .. 75 *f*
New man, the 21
Old man, conflict with the 11
,, ,, crucified with Christ 10
Regeneration, baptism a sign of .. .. 21, 33 *f*
,, meaning and result of .. .. .. 22 *ff*, 116
Resurrection 91
Romish Baptism .. .. 141 *ff*
Sacrament 74
Sanctification, practical 29
Seal, Baptism as a .. .. 19, 126 *f*
Spirit (the Holy), the Comforter 131
,, ,, given manifestly 132
,, ,, the Regenerator 25, 130
Sponsors .. .. 38, 101 *ff*
Trent, Canons of the Council of .. .. 2, 14 *F*, 78, 87, 137 *F*
Water, figure of cleansing 26
,, typical of death .. .. 14 *ff*, 16 *F*, 25

Digitized by Google

INDEX OF TEXTS.

	Chap.	Ver.	Page.
Genesis	6	7	25
	17	7	111
Exodus	24	7	42
	30	.. ..	67*f*
2 Chron.	30	19	129
Ezra	10	.. ..	49
Job	27	20	16
Psalms	32	6	16
	69	.. ..	16
	88	.. ..	16
	107	28	63
	124	.. ..	16
Isaiah	8	2	38
	43	2	16
	59	21	58
	61	9	112
Jeremiah	47	2	16
Lamen.	3	54	16
Amos	3	2	111*F*
Jonah	2	2-6	15
	3	10	63
Matthew	19	14	44, 59
	28	19	36
John	3	9*f*..	22, 25, 27*F*
	6	47	27
Acts	2	38, 39 ..	114*F*
	2	41	36
	8	27-39 ..	7*f*
	14	17	63
	16	32, 33 ..	46
	17	28, 29 ..	62
	26	3	52*F*
Romans	4	15	57*F*
	5	13	57*F*
	6	3-5 ..	14, 18, 108
	6	6	10
	6	11	12
1 Cor.	1	17-21 ..	81
	7	12-14 ..	47*f*
	15	29	91
2 Cor.	5	14	10
Galatians	2	20	10
	3	27	107
Ephesians	1	9	75
	1	13, 14 ..	133
	2	4-6	12
	2	10	6
	4	22-24 ..	11, 72
	5	26	22*F*
	6	4 ..	44, 59, 60*F*
Colossians	2	11	11*F*
	2	12 ..	13*f*, 18, 108
	3	3	10, 12
	3	9	72
	3	21	60*F*
1 Timothy	3	15	60*F*
Hebrews	8	12	6
1 Peter	1	3	26
	1	23	22
	3	10	16
	3	20	82*ff*
	3	21 ..	36, 45, 51, 58, 85, 114*F*, 136
1 John	5	8	70
Revelation	20	12	57*F*

Digitized by Google

REFLECTIONS

ON THE

Character and Spread of Spiritualism.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

Second Edition.

LONDON:

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,
12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, LONDON, E.C. 1.

1882.

Digitized by Google

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WERTHEIMER, LEA & CO.,
CIRCUS PLACE, LONDON WALL.

Digitized by Google

Introduction.

The first edition of this pamphlet was issued in 1876. The Appendix now added was not in the previous edition.

LONDON,
January, 1882.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

REFLECTIONS ON THE CHARACTER AND SPREAD OF SPIRITUALISM.

---

§ I.

ONE of the most appalling signs of the present hour is the indifference with which the progress of evil around us is regarded, even by those who seem to fear God and to reverence His Word. Many, even when the most indubitable facts are pressed on their attention, scornfully refuse to listen: others excuse themselves by saying that at a more convenient season they will hear. Never was there a time when resolute, energetic action against error was more needed than now; and yet, almost universally, aggressiveness is stigmatised and condemned, and a system of untruthful compromise and timorous conciliation sanctioned. Too readily we make self our centre, and become indifferent to every thing save that which bears immediately on ourselves. Yet it is a fearful thing to prefer dreamy repose to a truthful apprehension of *fact*. A time is drawing nigh when dreams must give place to realities, and when Truth must be recognised as being what it is. What if the recognition should come too late,

Digitized by Google

when the time of repentance and amendment shall have passed for ever? We have to remember the woe pronounced on those who refuse to discern "the signs of the times."

When, fifty years ago, Sacerdotalism and Idolatry stealthily re-entered this land, few recognised the greatness of the danger. They who were at that time the ostensible guardians of Protestantism, had for the most part settled down into a condition of self-satisfied complacency. They deemed their citadels so strong as to defy assault. They looked therefore on the efforts of their new assailants with contempt, and offered no serious resistance. The enemies of Protestantism saw their opportunity, seized it, worked, prospered, and secured their position. Neologian Infidelity followed. Its beginnings, too, were, for the most part, unheeded and unopposed: and we are seeing the results. Spiritualism has now come. It also is prospering. Some play and dally with it; others ridicule: but serious resistance there is none. They who see its real character are few, and their opposition is hesitating, intermittent, and feeble.

The progress of Spiritualism is now being very generally acknowledged. In the last number of the "British Quarterly" we read:—

"The revival in the 19th century of the long-disused practices of necromancy, is a startling fact. Since the year 1848, the number of persons in the United States who have betaken themselves to what, in the language of the

Digitized by Google

Pentateuch, is styled 'seeking after the dead,' is stated to amount to three millions. In this country they may be estimated at many thousands. The pursuit, under the inappropriate name of spiritualism, has been promoted by an active propaganda. . . . . Not only literature, but art, has been appealed to, for the re-establishment of ancient sorcery. . . . . The development of the asserted phenomena has been more rapid in England than in America. The earliest observers told of muffled knocks, or sharp electric crackles. Tables and other articles of furniture were endowed with motion. Musical instruments sounded in the dark. To these, it is asserted, have now succeeded more direct appeals to the senses. Faces, hands, and figures, resembling those of departed friends, have become visible in subdued light. Articulate sounds have been breathed through flexible tubes, mediums and others have floated in the air; bunches of lovely and delicate flowers have rained down through the darkness; fiery embers have been placed without injury on the hands and on the hair of the head, and at last every attribute of life, form, voice, tangible substances, manufactured clothing, and vigorous resistance to attempted violence have been displayed by what is said to be a disembodied spirit." (p. 456-7.)

Again, in an article recently published in the "Nonconformist," by Professor W. Barrett (Royal College of Science, Dublin), we read:—

"It cannot be denied that a belief in what is called Spiritualism, is spreading widely in every civilised country. An under-current of conversation on this subject is to be found almost everywhere in society. Familiarity with spiritual manifestations, and a firm conviction of their genuineness exist around us far more largely than is suspected, and especially is this the case in the upper classes; for not only have they much greater means and leisure to

Digitized by Google

conduct inquiries, but those to whom life is somewhat *blasé*, find in Spiritualism an ever-new sensation : they enter on its pursuit with zest, and, from inquirers, rapidly become converts. And all this in the present day, amidst its scepticism, its civilisation, and its glare of natural science! Nay, more; some in the very foremost rank of men of culture, and men of science assert, that the facts of Spiritualism are true, interpret them as we will. What shall we say to all these things?"

For more than twenty years I have been thoroughly convinced that "*the facts of Spiritualism are true.*" By this I do not mean that no deception, no collusion, is to be found among Spiritualists or their imitators. Satan has no desire that the operation of his power should become too manifest; and seeks therefore, not unfrequently, to discredit the thought of supernatural agency. It is, however true, that "some in the very foremost rank of men of culture, and men of science assert, that the facts of Spiritualism are true." In practical life, the evidence of our own senses, and the testimony of trustworthy witnesses are the two pillars on which we rest our convictions. Shall we set aside both, or either, of these foundations of belief? We must, if we deny that the facts of Spiritualism are true. For even if they have not been the subjects of our own personal observation, they are sustained by testimonies that cannot be arbitrarily set aside. Persons of the highest character, and of the most undoubted veracity, have avouched that they have known persons to be controlled by the simple action

Digitized by Google

of another's will, and that they have seen inanimate things receive commands and obey. The history of "table-turning" (which Tertullian speaks of as a means whereby, in his day, demons were consulted) affords many examples of this.*

I can indeed well understand that a person who rejects the Bible, or disbelieves the existence of an unseen world of evil spirits, would meet all these things with cold sceptical contempt, ending like that of Pyrrho in doubting every thing, and crediting nothing. But if we believe the Scripture, can we for a moment question that legions of evil spirits—devils (*δαιμονια*) environ us, and that they are able, whensoever God may permit, to act, not only *on* men, but *in* them?

Renounce the Scriptures, and we are guideless. We doubt, hesitate, grope, or else in proud self-confidence, rush madly forward, till we are lost in the blackness of darkness for ever. But if we receive the Scripture, and accept it as that which throws light on all the circumstances that ever meet us here, we shall never be left in hopeless perplexity of judgment. No one who believes the Scripture can doubt that it is possible for men to be brought into connexion with the unseen spiritual world of evil. Nay more, the normal condition of fallen humanity, when it has renounced God, is

* "Capable witnesses (says the *British Quarterly*) attest the existence of certain phenomena which are explicable on no known physical theory."

Digitized by Google

subjection to the control of evil spirits. Paganism is nothing more than the history of men, who having abandoned God, because "they did not like to retain him in their knowledge," have been given over to darkness, so as, unknowingly, to worship, consult, and be guided by, unclean spirits. What does the Apostle say of the refined and intellectual idolatry of Greece and Rome? He says (writing to Corinth, the very centre of educated and refined idolatry), "What the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils." Minerva, Diana, Venus, Mercury, and the like, were the ostensible names; but under those names devils were worshipped. A book which more, perhaps, than any other has thrown a halo around devil-worship, and, as it were, canonized it, is "The Iliad" of Homer. Let Christian parents remember this, and beware lest in educating their children, they give them books that make vice attractive, and abomination lovely.

Apollo, the Pythian Apollo, is a name that has fascinated, and still fascinates, many an ear. The influence of Apollo and his priestess, the Pythoness at Delphi, was in the ancient world marvellous. There were other oracles, but the oracle at Delphi was chief, and was venerated for ages by the philosophers, sages, and statesmen both of Greece and of Rome. Socrates so reverenced it that he would not permit Xenophon to enter on a projected journey until he had consulted it. "What colony did

Digitized by Google

Greece send to Æolia, Ionia, Asia, Sicily, or Italy, without consulting the Pythian, or Dodonæan oracles, or that of Hammon? Or what war was undertaken by them without the counsel of the gods?" Such are the words of Cicero in the commencement of his treatise, "De Divinatione"—a book that affords a most fearful example of the manner in which men of most vigorous and instructed minds can be made, when they have forsaken the true God, to lie prostrate before a power, the real character of which they know not, but which they recognise as something greater than themselves.

"Never," says Cicero, "would that oracle at Delphi have been so celebrated and so illustrious, nor would it have been stored with so many gifts from all kinds of peoples and kings, unless every age had experienced the truth of those oracles." "De Divinatione," § XIX. No doubt it is within the limits of possibility that Socrates and Cicero, and thousands of others, might in thus venerating the Delphic oracle have been the victims of a system of *mere human* trickery and deception: but it is in the last degree improbable; for men, when their own interests are at stake, are not long in discovering the trickery of their fellow-men, when that trickery is habitual. But the Delphic oracle maintained its ascendancy for centuries; and when its influence terminated, it terminated, not because its responses were mistrusted, but because its responses ceased. It became silent and departed. We

Digitized by Google

must not, however, suppose that the responses were unvaryingly true. They were often ambiguous, and sometimes wrong. Evil spirits are neither omniscient, nor omnipresent, and sometimes, moreover, it may be their wish and intention to deceive. If questioned respecting things that are present, or things that are past, they are able for the most part to reply correctly; and their superhuman knowledge of circumstances enables them (when God permits) to advise with super-human wisdom, or to reply with super-human correctness. Respecting the future, they, of course, know nothing *certainly*, except when God for His own wise ends permits them to become acquainted with any of His purposes. When God acts judicially or in chastisement, He may permit evil spirits to execute His will (see 1 Kings xxii. 21, 22). They who are to be gathered to Armageddon will be gathered "by spirits of devils working miracles." Satan accused Job in God's presence, and was permitted to chasten Job. Such relation to the government of God, gives to evil spirits a scope of knowledge that men have not. Their proper sphere of knowledge, however, is not the future, but the present and the past. This knowledge they displayed in various ways amongst the ancient Pagan nations; and it was generally recognised as supernatural knowledge. It is possible, no doubt, that all these nations and their leaders might have been deceived. But is it likely? On probabilities, however, we can found no conclusion *certainly*. The question,

Digitized by Google

therefore, respecting the real character of the agency developed in the Pagan oracles must have been left undecided, if the Scripture had been silent. But the Scripture has not been silent. It has spoken with a voice clear, distinct, and intelligible—a voice that must be reverenced and obeyed by every one who recognises the Scriptures as being what they are, "the oracles of God."

When Paul and Silas, restrained from their purpose of going towards the East, were sent with the message of salvation into Europe and the West, solitary and unbefriended, they entered Philippi. After a little, one poor woman, "whose heart the Lord opened," welcomed them. But in Philippi generally, if noticed at all, they were noticed only to be despised. Suddenly, however, one voice was heard, publicly saying, "These men are the servants of the most high God, which shew unto us the way of salvation." Should we, if we had been standing by and heard those words, have detected their origin, or should we have welcomed them? I fear we should have welcomed them. But Paul did not. He saw that it was an attempt (an attempt that has since fearfully succeeded in Christendom) to ally the Truth of Christ with the agents and agencies of Satan; and he withstood it. Those words (apparently so holy and so blessed), though uttered by means of a human tongue, proceeded really from a hidden unclean spirit. They were the words of a devil. "Paul being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name

Digitized by Google

of Jesus Christ to come out of her." The damsel in whom the unclean spirit was, had "brought to her masters much gain by soothsaying" (μαντικη, divination). She was what men now call *a medium*—a medium between themselves and the powers of darkness. That is simply the truth. It is a link that connects with hell, and with the fire that never shall be quenched. And what name is given in the Word of God to the spirit by means of which the damsel divined? It is said to have been the "spirit Pytho," the very spirit that guided the Pythian or Delphic oracle. By using that word "*Pytho*," the Word of God authoritatively reveals that the utterances of the Pythoness at Delphi were not human, but supernatural and Satanic; and in thus marking the character of the Delphic oracle it marks also the character of all that vast system of devil-worship of which the Delphic oracle was one of the chief pillars.* None who believe what is written in

* It is difficult to say what could have induced our translators to render πνευμα πυθωνος, a spirit of *divination*. Probably it was the desire to make the passage bear more directly on the forms of divination which they knew still lurked in Christendom, and they feared, I suppose, that the word "Pytho" would not be understood. But they were wrong in giving that translation, for really it is a comment, and not a translation; and it destroys the very instruction that the passage was written to give, instruction which is unspeakably important, because it *proves* the supernatural character of the influences that formed and guided Paganism. The reading of the *textus receptus* is πνευμα

Digitized by Google

Acts xvi., can doubt the real character of the Delphic oracle; nor will they ever regard the names of Apollo, or Pytho, or Delphi, as having any other savour than the savour of Hell. Nor will any one who does not reject the truth of the narrative in the Acts, refuse to acknowledge that DIVINATION is a real, and a supernatural thing. If men wish to consult and to be led by devils, the way is open. They may enter it if they please. Devils may be consulted through living men and women acting as mediums. Through living men and women, devils can speak; so was it in the case of the damsel at Philippi. Devils also can personate others. They can, and continually do, *personate* the dead. Hence necromancy. The dead do not return. They are *personated.* The deluded victims are placed *en rapport* with devils—not with their departed friends.

The evidence of the Old Testament is not less explicit than that of the New. God, in legislating for Israel, said: "A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit [*literally*, if there be in them an Ohv], or one that is a wizard,* shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: their blood shall be upon them."—Lev. xx. 27.

πυθωνος, *the spirit of Pytho:* of the revised text πνευμα πυθωνα, *the spirit Pytho.* Whichever reading be followed (the last is doubtless the correct one), the general result is the same.

* A knowing or wise person יִדְּעֹנִי, one instructed in the art of holding intercourse with demons.

Digitized by Google

This solemn passage shows that the inhabitation of any one by an Ohv must have been the result of voluntary acquiescence on the part of those whose bodies were so occupied; for God would not have punished with death that which was involuntary. Accordingly, at the present time they who become *mediums*, become so voluntarily. They deliberately choose to be what they are. Their blood is upon their own heads.

Again we read in Deut. xviii. 10-14:—

10. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch,

11. Or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, [*literally*, consulter of an Ohv] or a wizard or a necromancer [*literally*, one that enquires of the dead].

12. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations, the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee.

13. Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God.

14. For these nations which thou shalt possess, hearkened unto observers of times, and unto diviners; but as for thee, the Lord thy God hath not suffered thee to do so.

On the first part of this passage some observations will be found subsequently. At present I confine myself to the 11th verse, which is to a certain extent contrasted with that which precedes. The 10th verse treats of those kinds of divination in which demons are not *immediately* addressed, but

Digitized by Google

are consulted *mediately* by the intervention of signs, or when effects are produced by the instrumental use of medicaments, enchantments, &c. But in the 11th verse, words are used which imply a more *direct* appeal to evil spirits. Thus the first word (which properly means to bind, or join together, hence used of *fellowship* and *alliance*, see 2 Chron. xx. 36, and Ps. xciv. 20,) denotes a charmer who seeks by incantations and invocations to bring the being, or beings addressed, into association with himself. For this purpose incantations (επαοιδαι) were addressed to dæmons; and this, no doubt, is the meaning here. The *Chever*, or *charmer*, was one who chanted incantations to evil spirits in order to secure their aid, and to bring them into alliance or association with himself. In the present spiritualistic séances, hymns are frequently sung with this object. On that account I wish to direct especial attention to this verse. When such hymns are sung there is a voluntary, deliberate attempt to invite the presence and aid of evil spirits. Should God permit them to come, they may either enter into and take possession of the persons who have invoked them (in which case they would become *Ohvoth*, i.e. persons in whom an *Ohv* is); or they might have a spirit assigned to them as an associate or attendant—the meaning expressed apparently in our version by "*familiar spirit.*"

Thus the relation to an Ohv may be one of inhabitation; or it may be an external relation in which the Ohv is externally associated with him to whom

Digitized by Google

it is attached; or both relations may be combined. In either case let the awful words be remembered:—

"The soul that turneth after Ovoth [persons in whom an Ohv is] and one that is a wizard I WILL EVEN SET MY FACE AGAINST THAT SOUL AND WILL CUT HIM OFF FROM AMONG HIS PEOPLE."

Let no one, then, who sings hymns in spiritualistic séances and invokes demons, ever dare to sing unto God, for he is not a worshipper of God, but of Satan. And even if he go not so far as to join in the unholy incantation, if he be merely one who "consulteth Ohvoth" (Deut. xviii. 10), yet even then, what is he? Just what Saul was when he went to the Witch of Endor—one that had abandoned God, and chosen Satan. "So Saul died for his transgression, and also for his *consulting the Ohv to enquire of it.*"

That Ohv denotes an unclean spirit (similar to that which was in the damsel at Philippi) is evident from the verse already quoted from Lev. xx. 27, "A man or a woman if an Ohv be in them, or one who is a wizard shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: their blood shall be upon them." It is very evident too that Ohvoth denotes persons in whom an Ohv is.

As respects the derivation of the word אוֹב (Ohv), it is certain that in one passage in Job, Ohvoth (in the plural) is used to denote skins filled with wine, and therefore inflated and tumid. This tumidity being a characteristic of persons in whom an Ohv was, caused the name to be applied not only to the

Digitized by Google

persons who were thus affected, but to the spirit that caused the tumidity. This tumidity is marked in the well-known verses of Virgil as characteristic of the Pythoness when filled with the demoniacal afflatus, and if Spiritualism be permitted to advance, we shall, in all probability, find similar developments now. Gesenius says: "Ohv denotes a Python or soothsaying demon, of which these men were supposed [and really were] possessed. See Lev. xx. 27. 'A man or woman when a Python [Ohv] is in them.'" See Gesenius on אוֹב.*

---

* Parkhurst, in his Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, says: "I apprehend that both Ohv and Ohvoth may better be referred to the swelling or inflation with which the persons who had the Ohv *in them* (בהם Lev. xix. 31) were affected. Thus Ohv will be literally the inflated, and Ohvoth the woman *inflated* [or rather *persons* inflated; for the word is plural, and although having a feminine termination, does not appear to be confined to women]. Virgil has described an inflated Prophetess of this kind." Parkhurst then quotes the well-known passage in Virgil, in which the swollen and altered form of the Pythoness whilst under inspiration is described, and adds: "This shows what the heathen meant when they spoke of their Diviners being 'pleni Deo,' *full of the God.* And although in these frantic fits of the heathen Diviners there might frequently be much *affectation* and *imposture*, yet no doubt in many such instances, there was *a real possession by* an evil spirit. This is too plain to be denied in the case of the *divining damsel.* Acts xvi. 18." Parkhurst Lexion.

It was, however, only in the highest form of demoniacal manifestation that we read of such *excessive* affection of the bodies of the inspired persons. Some tokens of the

Digitized by Google

The following are the passages in which the word occurs:—

Lev. xix. 31. "Look not unto the Ohvoth,"—plural of Ohv.

Lev. xx. 6. "And the soul that turneth after the Ohvoth, and after wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people."

Lev. xx. 27. "A man also or a woman, when an Ohv shall be in them, or one who is a wizard, shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: their blood shall be upon them."

Deut. xviii. 11. "One that enquireth of an Ohv."

1 Sam. xxviii. 3. "Saul had put away the Ohvoth, and the wizards out of the land."

1 Sam. xxviii. 7. "Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that is possessed of

---

presence of a supernatural power there no doubt were; but in a more subdued form. In the case of the damsel at Philippi, and of the woman whom Saul consulted at Endor, there was no excitement of any kind; at least none is spoken of.

Digitized by Google

[literally, *that is mistress of*] an Ohv . . . . . and his servants said to him, Behold, there is a woman that is mistress of an Ohv at Endor."

1 Sam. xxviii. 8. "And he [Saul] said, Use divination, I pray thee, by means of the Ohv, and bring me him up whom I shall name to thee."

1 Sam. xxviii. 9. "Thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off the Ohvoth, and the wizards out of the land."

1 Chron. x. 13. "So Saul died for his transgression . . . . . and also for consulting the Ohv to enquire of it."

2 Kings xxi. 6. "And he [Manasseh] dealt with an Ohv and with wizards." Also 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6.

2 Kings xxiii. 24. "Moreover the Ohvoth and the wizards . . . . . did he [Josiah] put away."

Isaiah viii. 19. "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto the Ohvoth and unto wizards."

Isaiah xix. 3. "And they shall seek . . . . . unto the Ohvoth and the wizards."

Isaiah xxix. 4. "And thy voice like that of an Ohv out of the ground."

Digitized by Google

These are all the passages in which this word occurs, with the exception of one, where it is used to signify wine-skins or bottles. "My belly is as wine which has no vent: it is ready to burst as new wine-skins." This illustrates its meaning as applied to those possessed of Ohv.*

---

* The case of Saul, which is made so prominent in these passages, was one of necromancy. The woman at Endor is said to have been the mistress of an Ohv—the relation of the Ohv to her being (apparently) *external*, she holding communication with it as with "a familiar spirit." It was the habit of such persons then, even as now, to pretend that they were able to call up the dead: but it was a pretence merely. They called into their presence, not the dead, but the spirits with whom they were associated, and that spirit personated the dead. Saul, indeed, wished and expected to see Samuel; but the woman had no such expectation. She, no doubt, expected the spirit, with whom she was in fellowship, to appear and personate Samuel. When, instead of this, God really sent Samuel, the woman was dismayed and terrified. Her divination ceased; Samuel spake, and Saul answered. The modern necromancy which now abounds around us is personation merely. There is not a single instance in the whole Scripture, of a *disembodied* human spirit returning to earth, or having intercourse with men in it. Evil spirits are not deprived of any constituent part of their physical being, as originally created: but disembodied human spirits are. When, therefore, any of the departed have been sent back by God to have intercourse with any on the earth their bodies have been restored to them. So was it in the case of Samuel, and of those who, at the time of our Lord's resurrection came out of their graves and appeared unto many. To suppose that evil spirits have any power to lead and control the spirits of the departed, especially departed saints, is monstrous.

Digitized by Google

These, and other like passages that have been quoted, are sufficient to prove that in the times of the Prophets, and of the Lord, and of the Apostles, there were unquestionable manifestations of the agency of evil spirits. Devils, either instrumentally or immediately, spake, heard what was said to them, and acted accordingly. If such manifestations were no longer possible, the Scripture would distinctly have declared a fact so momentously important. But it has declared no such thing. On the contrary, we find "*sorcery*" (*φαρμακεια*) classed among those sins of which it is said, that "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. v. 21. In Rev. xxi. 8, we read that "the cowardly (*δειλοι*), and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers and SORCERERS (*φαρμακοι*), and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." And again, "without are dogs and SORCERERS." And in another passage, which belongs exclusively to the dispensation in which we live, we find it said "Neither repented they of their murders, nor of their SORCERIES." Rev. ix. 21. And of the last great city of human greatness it is said, "Thy merchants were the great men of the earth: for by thy SORCERIES were all nations deceived." Rev. xviii. 23 And when the now approaching hour for this dispensation to terminate comes, we read of "spirits of devils working miracles" that shall go forth to gather the armies of the whole Roman World

Digitized by Google

(τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης) to Armageddon. The gathering to Armageddon is not yet past. The Scripture therefore asserts the continuity of Satanic agency throughout the present Dispensation.

If we reject the Scripture we are unbelievers; and the doom of unbelievers we know. If on the other hand we profess to reverence the Scripture, and yet dally with Spiritualism, saying that its facts (though marvellous and at present utterly incapable of being accounted for on any natural principle) may, perhaps, at some future time be found capable of scientific explanation—if any so argue, they must be held to be defenders of Spiritualism; and we are justified in saying that their professed regard for Scripture is a pretence—not a reality. The Scripture has clearly supplied the solution of the question, and they refuse to accept it. If we were to follow their line of thought, we could never certainly accept any thing as supernatural; because it might always be pleaded that the advance of science might ultimately show that things apparently supernatural might be assigned to natural causes. Thus all the miracles of Scripture might be set aside; and what then would become of the evidences of our faith? Already some say that the miracles of Christ are to be classed among the phenomena of Spiritualism. God has not left us without power to distinguish between miraculous and natural agencies. He has endowed us with powers of discrimination; and our conscience well knows the difference between power

Digitized by Google

that emanates from physical agencies, physically controlled, and power set in motion by a fiat of our will, and acting potently, though not forcibly on other beings, so as to determine their will, and direct their actions. Moral influence is very different from physical. Nor can inanimate things hear. If we speak to them and they reply, supernatural agency must be present. Nor can secrets hidden from man be disclosed by any thing but a power superior to man. To say that such secrets have not been disclosed is to deny absolute facts. To pretend that science can account for them, is just as reasonable as to say that science can turn matter into spirit.

"Strong delusion" seems to have been allowed to come upon men's minds in estimating these and like subjects. Men seem enamoured of falsehood. Sacerdotalism has come in, leading to the most palpable idolatry, yet how has it been welcomed and adored! Neologianism has come in, leading to the most palpable infidelity, yet even Christians seem blinded as to its character, and (shall I say for selfish ends?) seek after its aid and alliance.* No positive line of demarcation is drawn between

* If the everlasting contrast between Christ's holy Truth and the ενεργεια πλανης, of which the Scripture speaks (2 Thess. ii. 11) had been discerned and maintained, the recent presence of Nonconformist ministers in Westminster Abbey, under the auspices of Neologianism, would not have been witnessed.

Digitized by Google

Truth and Falsehood. Spiritualism comes. Its facts are acknowledged: yet they awaken no feelings of holy awe. They are pronounced innocent, and such as science probably will one day explain. In the meanwhile Satan works: the pit is deepened: and millions sink into it, never probably, to rise from it again. Philanthropy that cleaves not to the Scripture is not true philanthropy: and union, unless it be union in the truth as revealed in Holy Scripture, will be an instrument of Satan to mislead, pervert, and destroy.

It is high time for the true ministers of Christ to awaken to a sense of their responsibilities as to these things. It is their clear duty to warn, preach, and testify against Spiritualism in all its forms. We may be called credulous, superstitious, weak-minded, and the like; but we care not for this when we know that we have Scripture on our side. Let us take heed that we be not caught by the current of the day and drawn in to amuse ourselves, or our children, with Table-turning, "Planchette," and the like. In that case we should ourselves become defiled, and the hand of God would be against us. Yet the door of repentance is not closed. We may retrace our steps, and make confession unto God. Let it be done, and done instantly. A slender cord may connect our raft with a vessel that is speeding on to ruin. Let the cord be cut instantly.

I believe it to be the solemn duty of every Christian minister to refuse admission to the Lord's

Digitized by Google

Table to all who persist in addicting themselves to Spiritualism. I believe it also to be the bounden duty of every minister, and of every private Christian, to refuse fellowship in any Christian work with all who practise or countenance it in any of its developments. Love to their souls and faithfulness to God requires that this testimony should be given. To countenance, even indirectly, a movement which, if it continue, will bring back a large section of society into the same subservience to evil spirits as was, and still is, found in Paganism, is a sin of the deepest die. The Scripture says that "a net is in vain spread in the sight of any bird." But men are not as birds. They see the snare, and yet rush into it.*

---

* Cyprian, of Carthage, had reason enough to examine the character of the Paganism that prevailed around him, and what is his testimony? He says: "These spirits lurk under the statues and consecrated images; these inspire the breasts of their prophets with their afflatus, animate the fibres of the entrails, direct the flights of birds, rule the lots, give efficiency to oracles, are always mixing up falsehood with truth, for they are both deceived and they deceive; they disturb their life, they disquiet their slumbers; their spirits also creeping into their bodies, secretly terrify their minds, distort their limbs, break their health, excite diseases to force them to the worship of themselves, so that when glutted with the steam of the altars and the piles of cattle, they may unloose what they had bound, and so appear to have effected a cure. The only remedy from them is when their own mischief ceases; nor have they any other desire than to call men away from God,

Digitized by Google

It is stated that there are among the Spiritualists many who are earnestly seeking to be delivered

---

and to turn them from the understanding of the true religion, to superstition with respect to themselves; and since they themselves are under punishment [they wish] to seek for themselves companions in punishment whom they may by their misguidance make sharers in their crime."—CYPRIAN, *On the Vanity of Idols.*

The early ecclesiastical writers (and they were no unintelligent observers) assumed as an unquestionable fact the agency of demons in the Pagan oracles and rites. Thus Sozomen speaking of Licinius says, that when he was about to make war with Constantine "he consulted the oracle of Apollo Didymus of Miletus concerning the result of the war, and received an answer *from the demon* couched in words from Homer. He was told that his strength had become enfeebled, and his old age would be hard." I quote this not as a proof of veracity in the oracle, but to show how distinctly Sozomen recognised the agency as supernatural and demoniacal.

Clement of Alexandria also, speaking of the heathen oracles, says, "It is evident, since they are demoniac spirits, that they know some things both more quickly and more perfectly [than men]; for they are not retarded in their learning by the heaviness of a body. And therefore they, as being spirits, know without delay and without difficulty what physicians attain after a long time and by much labour. It is not wonderful, therefore, if they know somewhat more than men do; but this is to be observed, that what they know they do not employ for the salvation of souls, but for the deception of them, that by means of it they may indoctrinate them in the worship of false religion. But God, that the error of so great deception might not be concealed, and that He Himself might not seem to be a cause of error

Digitized by Google

from certain harassing and tormenting influences under which they are suffering. I have heard of one, once a leader in the system, but now desirous of deliverance, who is reported to have said that he has received, from a multitude of persons, letters requesting him to tell them whether he knew any mode of extrication; but that his answer was, that he knew how persons might become possessed of the power, but that he could not tell them how to be delivered from it. To follow Satan and to be allured into the snare, is easy: but deliverance can come from God alone. It will be found only by those who repent and make confession unto God and forsake the sin, and cast themselves on the grace of God through the atoning blood of Jesus. They who thus seek Him will, doubtless, like Manasseh of old, find mercy. "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow." But if (as was recently

---

in permitting them so great licence to deceive men by divinations, and cures, and dreams, has of His mercy furnished men with a remedy, and has made the distinction of falsehood and truth patent to those who desire to know. This, therefore, is that distinction: what is spoken by the true God, whether by prophets or by divers visions, is always true; but what is foretold by demons is not always true. It is therefore an evident sign that those things are not spoken by the true God, in which, at any time, there is falsehood, for in truth there is never falsehood. But in the case of those who speak falsehoods, there may occasionally be a slight mixture of truth, to give as it were seasoning to the falsehoods."

Digitized by Google

done in London) deliverance be sought by invoking spirits, madly *supposed* to be good, to give aid against other spirits recognised as evil, sin is added unto sin, and the pit of ruin deepened. On the occasion to which I refer, a lying spirit, invoked by incantation, supplied the counsel that was asked for. It was to the effect that the best mode of pacifying the restless and evil-minded spirits was, not to offer them resistance, but to parley with, soothe, and propitiate them. The propitiation of demons was in ancient, and still is in modern paganism, a duty daily enforced, and daily practised. Is this the bondage that men covet? It would seem so: for they are rushing back into it again.

Brainerd, in his narrative of his work among the American Indians, mentions, as one of his greatest difficulties, the conviction that prevailed among them that their diviners were possessed of supernatural power. "When," says Brainerd, "I have instructed them respecting the miracles wrought by Christ in healing the sick, &c., and mentioned them as evidences of His divine mission, and of the truth of His doctrines, they have quickly referred to the wonders of that kind which this man [a diviner, afterwards converted] had performed by his magic charms; whence they had a high opinion of him and his superstitious notions, which seemed to be a fatal obstruction to some of them in the way of their receiving the Gospel. . . . . My interpreter tells me that he heard one of them tell a certain Indian the secret thoughts of his heart, which he had never

Digitized by Google

divulged. The case was this: the Indian was bitten by a snake, and was in extreme pain from the bite; whereupon the diviner (who was applied to for his recovery) told him that such a time he had promised that the next deer which he killed he would sacrifice to some great power, but had broken his promise. 'And now,' said he, 'that great power has ordered this great snake to bite you for your neglect.' The Indian confessed that it was so, but said he had never told anybody of it. But as Satan, no doubt, excited the Indian to make that promise, it was no wonder he should be able to communicate the matter to the conjuror. These things serve to fix them in their idolatry, and to make them believe there is no safety to be expected, but by their continuing to offer such sacrifices. And the influence that these diviners have upon them, either through the esteem or the fear which they have of them, is no small hindrance to their embracing Christianity."

Brainerd's narrative will, no doubt, be derided by many; yet, to deny the possibility of such things, is to reject Scripture. If the magicians of Egypt could work miracles, and resist Moses; if the woman at Endor could, as the mistress of an Ohv, divine; if the damsel at Philippi, as having "the spirit of Pytho," could "bring her masters much gain by soothsaying," why is that which was possible then, impossible now? God has not declared that the action of Satanic power has ceased. If it had ceased, He would have told us so. But He has not

Digitized by Google

told us so. On the contrary, He has expressly warned us against doctrines proceeding from "devils that speak lies in hypocrisy" (*δαιμονιων ψευδολογων εν ὑποκρισει*). He has said also, "Believe not *every spirit*, but try the spirits whether they be of God:" and in a passage in the Revelation, avowedly future, He has (as I have already said) spoken of the last great gathering to Armageddon being effected by "*spirits of devils working miracles.*" Seeing, then, that the Scriptures have plainly declared that the agency of evil spirits shall not only continue, but be more and more manifested till the end of the present dispensation comes, how, I say, can we marvel that these plain declarations of Scripture should from time to time receive the confirmation of facts? We may, if we please, reject Scripture, and reject facts. But what remains to us then? Sure subservience to the will and power of Satan in this world: and in the world to come "the second death."

Brainerd was not fanatical or superstitious. He was a man of calm judgment and of well-balanced mind. Yet he evidently believed that the Indian diviners were possessed of supernatural power. Respecting the diviner already mentioned as converted by him, Brainerd relates that all his former power of divination departed from him the moment the Word of God found entrance into his soul. He could divine no longer: but was as other men.* Let

* "He [the diviner] says, that upon his feeling the word of

Digitized by Google

this be laid to heart by those who have been tempted to tamper with Spiritualism in any of its forms. What does this fact respecting the Indian diviner show? It shows that the spirit of divination and the Spirit of Christ cannot dwell in the same bosom. He that hath the spirit of divination hath not the spirit of Christ, and "he that hath not the spirit of Christ *is none of His.*" If the Word of God be true, the doom of those who are found in association with the unseen spiritual world of evil is *perdition.* Yet men with the Scripture in their hands are so utterly blinded (I suppose judicially blinded) as not to discern this. On the contrary, they regard this "power of conversing with spirits" as being a gift of God's mercy, and deem it to be a fulfilment of His promise in Joel; "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out MY SPIRIT upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall

---

God in his heart (as he expresses it) his spirit of conjuration left him entirely: that he has had no more power of that nature since, than any other man living. He declares that he does not now so much as know how he used to charm and conjure; and that he could not do anything of that nature, if he was ever so desirous of it."—*Brainerd*, p. 562.

In an incantation-séance, lately held in Hampshire, it was stated by the presiding medium, that the advent of the spirits addressed would not be hindered by the presence of those who were simply incredulous, but that it would be hindered by the presence of those who were decidedly HOSTILE. May God grant to us the *hostility* of His own Spirit to these things.

Digitized by Google

prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out MY SPIRIT." These words are in a book* now open before me, applied to spiritualistic powers of intercourse with unclean spirits. Can any delusion be deeper, any more awful than this? It calls to remembrance the words, "God shall send upon them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie."

The motives which induce men to enter this awful circle are various. Idle curiosity prompts many. Others do it for amusement sake. They and their children are entertained by "table-turning," and by "Planchette" (the "Teraphim" of modern times), to which they address their senseless or their serious questions, and obtain written replies. The plea of others is that Spiritualism is likely to supply new and efficient means for the healing of disease: others say that they are prompted by the love of science: they wish to observe and classify phenomena and the like. Excuses are easily invented when the heart is set upon following a path it loves. Yet, whatever be the motive, it should be remembered that none who enter the charmed circle have any right to expect deliverance from the awful power that there

* This book, published in London, has reached a second edition.

Digitized by Google

operates. I do not say that they will not, for God's mercies are infinite: but none have any right to assume that after they have deliberately brought themselves into direct communication with the spirits of darkness, they will be rescued from the results. God has given to all men a power to distinguish between that which does, and that which does not, fall within the scope of men's natural powers, and if they refuse to use this power of discernment, they must meet the consequences. No one believes that he is able to make an iron axe rise to the surface of the water and swim. See 2 Kings vi. No one believes that such a result is the effect of natural laws. In the same way, when heavy bodies are seen to rise unsupported into the air, or when inanimate matter is seen to move at human command, and to hear and answer questions, men must voluntarily and designedly forego the exercise of their powers of discrimination which God has given them to use, if they are unconscious that they are in the presence of supernatural power. Such unconsciousness (if indeed it really exist) is a symptom of the very deepest moral disease; for it shows that a power of delusion has come over the soul that has quenched even the apprehensions which nature itself gives. To recognise that the power is supernatural, and to believe that it is from God, is, no doubt, a deeper delusion still—so deep, that it seems utterly hopeless.

There are periods (the Protestant Reformation was one) when God mercifully interferes to extri-

Digitized by Google

cate men from darkness in which they have involved themselves, and leads them back from bewilderment into light. There are other periods when, light having been perverted and abused, God permits men to "withdraw" (see Heb. x. 38) from the care and guidance of His hand, to abandon Truth, and to serve falsehood. Any who read in the light of Scripture the signs of the present hour, must acknowledge that so it is now. At such a moment the faintest indication of a disposition to "withdraw" from light is ominous. Retrogression now will probably be retrogression for ever.

Nevertheless, dark and discouraging as the aspect of things around us is, the hour is not yet come when it shall be finally said, "he that is filthy, let him be filthy still." "The fountain opened for sin and for all uncleanness" in the blood of the Lamb, is not yet closed. The master of the house has not yet risen up and shut to the door. Still God preaches peace through Jesus Christ. Still Jesus saith, "Look unto ME, and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth." "We are accounted righteous before God only because of the merit (propter meritum) of our Lord Jesus Christ through faith (per fidem), and not for our own works or deservings." (Article XI.) Christ hath borne the wrath due to the sins of His believing people, and hath presented for them all His own perfectness unto God; consequently, under all the value of that perfectness they stand. The door into this great and free salvation is not yet closed. "The Spirit and the bride say,

Digitized by Google

Come; and let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." Rev. xxii. 17. The "Spiritualist," great and terrible as his transgression is, may nevertheless, repent, forsake his sin, and cast himself on the grace of God through the blood of the Lamb, and then like Manasseh, he will find mercy.

> "Sick sinner, expect no balm but Christ's blood,
> Thine own works reject, the bad and the good.
> None ever miscarry who on Him rely,
> Though filthy as Mary, Manasseh, or I." *

Mary Magdalene was one out of whom were cast "seven devils." Manasseh "caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom: also he observed times and used enchantments, and used witchcraft and dealt with a familiar spirit (an Ohv), and with wizards: he wrought much evil in the sight of the Lord to provoke Him to anger." . . . . But "when he was in affliction he besought the Lord his God, and humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers, and prayed unto Him, and He was intreated of him, and brought him again to Jerusalem into his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the Lord, He was God." 2 Chron. xxxiii. Such was the grace shown to Manasseh, and like grace will be shown to all

* Hart's *Hymns.*

Digitized by Google

who after having allied themselves to demons, repent and turn for refuge unto God. But if they persist in their iniquity there can be no hope. Their sin is greater than that of Manasseh, for it is committed against greater light.

The same verse that saith, "Blessed are they that wash their garments (*μακαριοι οἱ πλυνοντες τας στολας αυτων*), that they may have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city," saith also, "without are dogs and *sorcerers* . . . . and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." Satan is the father of lies. Spiritualistic power necessarily makes every one that possesses it a maker of lies; and they who are deceived by this power will soon find that they love the lies whereby they are deluded.

Note on Deuteronomy xviii. 9-14.

In "Thoughts on parts of Isaiah," p. 70, I have remarked on this verse as follows:—

"It is quite impossible to define with precision the various appellations that occur in these verses, or to determine the exact distinction between them: nor is it needful, for their general bearing is obvious. They may, however, be translated a little more carefully than they have been in our version. They may be rendered thus: "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or

Digitized by Google

his daughter pass through the fire,*—one that useth divination, an observer, or an augur, or a sorcerer: or a user of incantations, or a consulter of Ohv, or a wizard, or an enquirer of the dead."

Of these descriptions I regard the second, viz., "*one that divineth divinations,*" קסם קסמים, as the most comprehensive. I consider it to be a generic term, including under it the various specific forms of divination subsequently mentioned. Thus this word is applied to Balaam [see Josh. xiii. 22] who divined *by omens* נחשים [see Num. xxiv. 1], as also to the witch of Endor, who divined *not* by omens, but *by Ohv*—the name in Hebrew of the unclean spirit by whom she divined, just as the damsel in the Acts is said to have divined by the spirit Pytho. These two examples show that the word קסם is applied to very different kinds of divination, and prove its generic use.

It is not easy to determine the specific meaning of מעונן, which is the word used by Isaiah in the chapter before us, and is in our version rendered "*soothsayer,*" but in Deut. xviii. is translated "*observer of times,*" a rendering frequently given by our translators. "Soothsayer," which means a sayer of [pretended] truth," is not a suitable rendering, for the etymology of מעונן, and its contextual asso-

* "This is not the consuming of their children to Moloch, but by way of lustration, a mock baptism, a piece of witchcraft, to preserve from violent death."—Gilpin's *Demonologia Sacra*, p. 28

Digitized by Google

ciation in Scripture, indicate *observation*. There is, however, nothing in the word that indicates observation *of times* any more than the observation of other things. It seems rather to denote such observation as requires the careful use of the eye in minute inspection, such as was used by the *haruspices*, whose peculiar office was to inspect the entrails of victims, and in this differed from the *augurs* who judged from the flight and voices of birds, and other palpable signs, using the ear no less than the eye. I have little doubt that this word refers to that part of the science of divination in which the eye was employed in minute inspection, especially of the entrails of victims. The Jerusalem Targum renders this word, *to inspect serpents*.

"*Enchanter*," which is the word used by our translators in this passage in Deuteronomy, as the rendering of מנחש is certainly not an accurate translation, such as is ascribed to the serpent [נחש], and is twice used in a good sense, namely, in Gen. xxx. 27, where Laban says, "*I have learned by experience* [or observation] *that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake*," and in 1 Kings xx. 33, where it is translated, *diligently observe*. "Now the men did *diligently observe*." It seems to denote that kind of quick observation which notes signs and tokens, whether presented to the eye or to the ear. This was especially the province of the augur. In Gen. xliv. 5, and the connected verse, it is translated by the generic word "divine." "Wot ye not that such a man as I could certainly divine."

Digitized by Google

The word translated "wizard" (כשף) means properly "one that uses sorceries;" LXX. *φαρμακευεσθαι*;* Vulg. *maleficis artibus inservire.* In Exodus vii. 11, it is translated *sorcerers.* "Then Pharaoh called the wise men and the *sorcerers.* Now the magicians of Egypt they also did in like manner with their enchantments." The application of the word to the sorcerers summoned by Pharaoh, sufficiently defines its meaning, and proves that the power possessed by these persons was real and Satanic.

---

* For some valuable observations on the use of this word, see Gilpin's *Demonologia*, p. 27.

Digitized by Google

§ II.

In the verse that follows that which has been considered in the preceding note, words are used which imply a more direct and immediate appeal to evil spirits. "There shall not be found among you . . . . a user of incantations [a charmer], or a consulter of Ohv, or a wizard, or an enquirer of the dead: for all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord," etc.

The verse has already been remarked on in the preceding pages. See pages 14 and 15.

Modern Spiritualism *chiefly* devotes itself to that branch of sorcery which leads into immediate intercourse with evil spirits as described in the verse just quoted. But whether spirits be consulted *immediately*, as in necromancy and in enquiring through mediums (ohvoth): or whether they be consulted *mediately* through omens and signs, the sin is the same, because in either case God is abandoned for Satan, and the ordinances of God's government are violated. It is lawful for man to attain knowledge in natural things through the exercise of the natural powers which God has given him to that end. Electricity is a natural agency: it is lawful for man to acquaint himself with the laws that guide it. When he has attained the knowledge of those laws, he finds that it is a power which he can (not by the mere exertion of his will, but) by means of physical appli-

Digitized by Google

ances, limit, direct, and control. But the moment we come to a sphere of thought, knowledge, or action, where man's *natural* powers fail him, and where he is obliged to look for aid and instruction to a source external to himself, it is utterly unlawful for man to seek unto any one, save the one only true God. If we seek supernatural aid or instruction from any one, save God, it can only be attained by recourse to the great Enemy of God. He only can supply it. In turning to him, we deliberately abandon God, and deliberately choose Satan. Such is the path into which Spiritualism invites. We enter that path the moment we consent to amuse ourselves with "Planchette," or place ourselves under the influence of mesmeric passes. No doubt they who join in séances to invoke by incantations the aid of evil spirits, are further matured in these mysteries of wickedness: but the first step associates us with the system, and with the responsibilities of its ulterior results.

If they who fear God should be induced by the consideration of these things to reflect more than they have heretofore done, on the reality and extent and terribleness of the power of Satan, some good may result from the calamitous spread of Spiritualism. The action of Satan is of course strictly under the limitation and control of God. "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther." Yet the power that he, and the spirits under him, are able to wield, is second only to the power of God. "In a moment of time" (Luke iv. 5) Satan showed unto the Lord Jesus

Digitized by Google

"all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them" (Matt. iv. 8). The lightnings and the winds of heaven, as well as the Sabæans and Chaldæans of earth, were all under his control when he went forth to afflict Job. He smote Job also with "sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown." By him the magicians of Egypt were enabled to meet with counter-miracles the miracles of the servant of God. The spirits that are under him are called in one place, "the host of the high ones that are on high" (Is. xxiv. 21); in another, "the power or authority (εξουσια) of the air" (Eph. ii. 2); in another, "the rulers [too weak a word to express κοσμοκρατορες] of the darkness of this age." Their number is so vast that in Mary Magdalene *seven* devils dwelt: in another, a multitude whose name was *Legion*. Their association with human things brings them into connection with the government of God, and on that ground they have access into His presence. (1 Kings xxii. 21.) Thus when the sons of God presented themselves before the Lord, Satan came also among them. As "the accuser of the brethren" he has access to heaven, and "accuses them before God day and night;" nor will he be deprived of this title until the course of his triumph as "the God of this age" is about to terminate for ever. See Rev. xii. 10. These, and like things, give to Satan and the spirits that are under him, a scope of knowledge and observation so vast, that our present powers of comprehension are utterly unable to grasp its magnitude.

Digitized by Google

Now, it is this power so threatening, so overwhelmingly terrible to fallen men, that Satan seeks to conceal. He wishes not that his victims should watch his steps, or know his methods. He desires that his own individuality and agency, and the individuality and agency of the spirits under him should be shrouded, and if possible unknown: and unknown they would be if the Scripture had not spoken. Spiritualism does not teach that the unseen spiritual existences around us are beings once angelic, but now fallen, and brought into a condition of essential, hopeless, and everlasting enmity to God. It conceals this awful truth, and teaches instead, that the spirits around us are not damned spirits. On the contrary, it teaches us that some are good, others evil, but none hopelessly evil; none hopelessly miserable; and that the evil are susceptible of improvement, and open to the influences of good. Thus there is an entire rejection of all that Scripture teaches respecting that which it terms "spiritual wickedness." According to spiritualistic doctrine, there is no Satan; no devils in the sense in which Scripture uses that term; no eternal misery; no eternal punishment. According to this lying doctrine, men act in conformity with the natural law of their being in connecting themselves with this unseen spiritual world, and thence gaining instruction and aid. Accordingly, in every age (say they) some men have done this. Spiritual manifestations were found among the ancient heathen: they were found in Israel in the time of the Pro-

Digitized by Google

phets: they were found there in the time of Jesus and His Apostles: they are found amongst us now. All such manifestations, according to the spiritualistic doctrine, are (mark the fearfulness of the blasphemy) generically the same, though circumstantially they may differ. The manifestations in the Prophets, and in the Apostles, and in Christ, were not (it is said) essentially different from those which we read of in Pagan history, and those which we see in the spiritualistic developments of the present hour. That such statements are made (statements which seem to approach very nearly, if not quite, to that sin which can never be forgiven) is proved by the following quotation from a work entitled "*The Evidences of Spiritualism.*" The writer is speaking of some of the modes adopted by spirits in making known their presence, and says:—

"If anyone shall feel inclined to laugh at the production of fruit and flowers by spiritual means, I would remind him that this is exactly what was done in the case of Aaron's rod, which brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds. (Num. xvii. 8.) If 'spirit hands' provoke mirth, we must at any rate bear in mind that such things *have* been seen. 'He put forth *the form of an hand*, and took me by a lock of mine head.' (Ezek. viii. 3.) 'In the same hour came forth *fingers of a man's hand*, and wrote upon the plaister of the wall; and the king *saw the part of the hand* that wrote.' (Dan. v. 5.) The 'touching' of people's knees, etc., by these hands, again, may be ludicrous enough; but, as we have seen, a spirit or angel touched Jacob in the *thigh*, and Elijah and Daniel were similarly touched Mrs. Guppy is *said* to have produced, in the

Digitized by Google

midst of a circle, by the aid of spirits, 'three live *eels*.' I may doubt the fact, but I shall not see in it anything so very mirth-moving if I believe that Pharaoh's magicians could rival Moses and Aaron in evoking or producing *frogs*, and sending them into the houses and bedrooms of the Egyptians. 'Spirit lights or fires moving about a room,' are common phenomena. And I find constantly in Scripture the appearance of lights and fires accompanying spiritual manifestations. Thus, in the above-cited passage from Ezekiel, 'I beheld, and lo a likeness in the appearance of a fire.' In the Acts, 'tongues as of fire settle on the Apostles. A cold wind passes over the Hon. Mrs. Egerton when she sees the spirits; and we are told in the *Spiritualist* that 'the first symptom of the invisible power at work is often a feeling like a cold wind sweeping over the hands; and so on this very day of Pentecost, 'there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.' Mrs. Honeywood's house vibrates in such a fashion that no machinery can have produced the result. So in Acts iv. 31, the place was *shaken* where the disciples were assembled together. Mr. Home and others are carried off into the air; so was Philip, so was Ezekiel on two occasions. The 'gift of tongues,' again, is asserted to be one of the manifestations, and this, as we all know, is to be found in the New Testament. It may be said that the scriptural narratives have produced these imitations. Very well! but then what becomes of the charge of their being *of a ludicrous character*, which is what I have been considering?" Pp. 88—90.

I will add only two more quotations from a work entitled, "*On Miracles and Modern Spiritualism.*"

"Both the Old and the New Testaments are full of spiritualism, and Spiritualists alone can read the record with

Digitized by Google

an enlightened belief. The hand that wrote upon the wall at Belshazzar's feast, and the three men unhurt in Nebuchadnezzar's fiery furnace, are for them actual facts which they need not explain away. St. Paul's language about 'spiritual gifts,' and 'trying the spirits,' is to them intelligible language, and 'the gift of tongues,' a simple fact. When Christ cast out 'devils' or 'evil spirits,' He really did so—not merely startle a madman into momentary quiescence; and the water changed into wine, as well as the bread and fishes continually renewed till five thousand men were fed, are credible, as extreme manifestations of a power which is still daily at work among us. . . . . Our modern teachers maintain they know a great deal about God . . . . . and they declare that after death we shall be with Him, and shall see Him and know Him. In the teaching of the 'spirits' there is not a word of this. They tell us they commune with higher intelligences than themselves, but of God they really *know* no more than we do."

These extracts, not taken from the same author, are sufficient to show the character of the abyss into which Spiritualism leads. Though sometimes it may have the horns of a lamb, its voice is the voice of a Dragon. Association under any circumstances with persons who can think and write thus must be a sin of the deepest dye. If the miracles of Moses were not different in their origin from those wrought by the magicians of Egypt, if generically they are to be classed together, then we must allow that there is no essential distinction between evil and good, Hell and Heaven, Satan and God; and the Scripture which teaches us that there is an essential distinction between them, must be rejected

Digitized by Google

as a lie. Whatever judgment may be formed of the facts of Spiritualism, the fact that it is associated with blasphemies such as these cannot be denied.

The arguments most frequently relied on to disprove the reality of spiritualistic manifestations are:—First, the fact that *some* manifestations, that had been recognised by Spiritualists as genuine, have been proved to be impostures. Secondly, that like wonders have been wrought by sleight of hand. These arguments, however, prove nothing. Impostors and jugglers there have ever been. Such persons existed in the times when the Scriptures were written, as well as now. Yet their existence was quite compatible with the fact that persons who really had supernatural power existed also. Else we must reject what the Scripture declares respecting the magicians of Egypt, and the damsel at Philippi. *Their* exercise of supernatural power was not pretence, but reality. If pretence and fact could exist side by side *then*, they can equally co-exist *now*. Nor must it be forgotten, that *some* of the recorded facts of divination and mesmerism and spiritualism (all specific variations coming under one common genus) are altogether beyond the capacity of those who work these wonders by mere sleight of hand. Some jugglers, too, are no doubt supernaturally aided. One so aided, is, I believe, now acting in this country. India also supplies abundant instances. Between such jugglers and spiritualists, no *essential* difference exists.

Again, it has been urged by some that if mediums

Digitized by Google

and diviners were able to reveal secrets at all, they would be able to reveal *all* secrets, and to answer *all* questions. They who argue thus seem to forget that God *limits* the power of evil spirits. It would indeed be a fearful thing if evil spirits were permitted to answer *all* the questions which men's curiosity, or covetousness, or malice might suggest. The future, evil spirits know not, except so far as they may be acquainted with any of the declarations of God respecting it. And even as to the present and the past, unlimited power of communicating what they know is not accorded them. But that God has permitted certain powers to be exercised, and certain questions to be answered by them is manifest both from Scripture and from fact.*

---

* In Faber's "*Pagan Idolatry*," (G. Stanley Faber—not the Romanist) will be found a long dissertation on Pagan Oracles. He shows by a large induction of instances, that when questioned respecting present or past things they commonly answered correctly; when questioned respecting future things, they answered ambiguously or wrongly.

The case of Crœsus, King of Lydia, is well known. He was anxious to ascertain whether the truth of the oracles could be confided in, and therefore determined to test them by a question which no one unassisted by supernatural power could answer. Sending messengers to seven different oracles (whose names Herodotus gives), Crœsus bade them inquire at a given hour on a given day, what the King of Lydia was at that moment doing. The oracle of Amphiaraus, we are told, answered correctly; but the answer is not recorded. As soon as the oracle at Delphi was questioned, it replied thus :—

Digitized by Google

It is utterly impossible that any satisfactory argument to disprove the existence of evil supernatural

---

"The number of the sand of the sea, and the measure of the sea I know,
The dumb I understand, and him that has not learned to speak I hear.
The savour to my soul hath come of a hard-skinned tortoise
Boiled in a cauldron of brass, together with the flesh of lambs,
Beneath which brass is spread, and which with brass is covered."

The answer was correct. The king, in order that he might do a thing most unlikely to be conjectured, had gone into his kitchen, and boiled together the flesh of a lamb and of a tortoise in a brazen cauldron, on which he placed a brazen lid. "Augustine observes in several places," (says Rollin in relating this occurrence) "that God, to punish the blindness of the Pagans, sometimes permitted *the devils* to give answers according to the truth." That "the spirit Pytho" which divined at Delphi was a devil, we know from Scripture. Why then should we marvel that the question of Crœsus was answered correctly?

The confidence of Crœsus was thus gained. He was most anxious to be advised respecting a war which he meditated against Cyrus. He asked the oracle whether or not he should undertake it. The reply was, "Crœsus when he has crossed the Halys [the river which divided his dominions from those of Cyrus] will destroy a mighty empire." It was an ambiguous answer. Crœsus, however, interpreted it as favourable to himself; made war on Cyrus, and was ruined. It was a war which in its results has affected the whole course of the world's subsequent history. It was the means of bringing Persia into conflict with Greece; led

Digitized by Google

power could be adduced, unless it could be shown *from Scripture* that the power of action allowed to evil spirits in previous dispensations, had, in this dispensation, been taken from them. This cannot be shown. On the contrary, the Scriptures not only declare that such powers can be exercised now, but they also forewarn us that, at the now approaching close of the present dispensation, it will be exercised more abundantly and more terribly than ever before. To ridicule, therefore, these things is not only unwise, but it is evil. It is unwise, because ridicule on such subjects can by no possibility affect (except repulsively) anyone of staid and

---

ultimately to the conquests of Alexander; and those conquests have moulded the world's history ever since.

Oracular answers to questions have not been unfrequent in modern times. Not long ago a gentleman well known to me, lost a favourite dog. He went to a celebrated diviner then in London, and asked him where he could find it. The diviner immediately told him, mentioned the name of the dog, which had not been made known to him. In the place indicated the dog was found. This gentleman was accompanied by a friend, who asked certain questions respecting himself (his name not having been disclosed) and his family. Replies yet more astonishing were given.

In the commencement of the last century Defoe gives the history of a celebrated diviner in London with whom he was intimately acquainted. Defoe was thoroughly convinced that this person, and his mother before him, were both possessed of supernatural power, and gives fact upon fact in proof of this. The memoir, however, is not marked by a spirit of holiness or of the fear of God.

Digitized by Google

reflective mind: secondly, it shows that our own condition of heart is wrong in having failed to appreciate, as we should, the character of those powers of darkness against which we have to wrestle. (Eph. vi. 12.) Prayer and the use of the Word of God should be our weapons—not ridicule.

Digitized by Google

§ III.

I HAVE already quoted the words of *The British Quarterly*, October, 1875, p. 460. "Competent witnesses" (says that journal) "attest the occurrence of certain phenomena, both physical and intellectual, which are explicable on no known physical theory."

And again, p. 459, "We shall point out that while there is ample testimony as to the occurrence of phenomena inexplicable according to the general order and limitation of organic life, the study of these phenomena has not advanced a single step beyond the establishment of their objective reality."

The British Quarterly must certainly be regarded as an unprejudiced witness. It unequivocally admits that the phenomena are not frauds, but facts, utterly "inexplicable on any known physical theory."

Mr. Crookes, F.R.S., in *The Quarterly Journal of Science*, says, "That certain physical phenomena, such as the movement of material substances, and the production of sounds resembling electric discharges, occur under circumstances in which they cannot be explained by any physical law at present known, is a fact of which I am as certain as I am of

Digitized by Google

the most elementary fact in chemistry. My whole scientific education has been one long lesson of exactness in observation; and I wish it to be distinctly understood that this firm conviction is the result of most careful investigation."—*Evidences of Spiritualism,** p. 50.

Mr. J. M. Peebles, the United States Consul at Trebizond, in a lecture delivered at Battle Creek, near Chicago, and published in the Chicago paper, *The Present Age,* of Sept. 3rd, 1870, relates the following in connection with the Right Honourable John Bright:—"While in England I dined with John Bright, when transpired quite an earnest conversation on the subject of Spiritualism. He said he had witnessed some of D. D. Home's manifestations. He could attribute them to no cause unless it be the one alleged, that of intelligent disembodied spirits. 'But,' he added, with due caution, 'I do not say that this is so; but if it be true, it is the strongest tangible proof we have of immortality.'" †—*Evidences of Spiritualism,* p. 50.

---

* "Mr. Crookes's statement of the temper and method in which the investigation of any obscure phenomena should be approached, breathes the true spirit of philosophic inquiry. Elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, on the first proposal, while yet a young man, as the discoverer of a new metal, Mr. Crookes is known for his researches in chemical analysis, photography, metallurgy, physical optics, astronomy, and meteorology."—*British Quarterly Review,* p. 459.

† These words are utterly unjustifiable, even if the spirits were disembodied human spirits, which they were not.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Wallace and Dr. Mahan, First President of Oberlin College, Ohio, have both written elaborately on the subject. They both admit the reality of the facts, though they do not agree in their mode of accounting for them. Dr. Mahan says that he has met with evidence which "he could not resist with integrity," "of the reality of physical manifestations of a very startling and impressive character." "As far as the intelligent communications are concerned," he has "found equally valid evidences for the reality of the facts of Spiritualism."—*British Quarterly*, p. 463.

"Slowly and reluctantly," Mr. Wallace "became convinced of the occurrence of facts, but it was long before he found himself compelled to refer the phenomena to any incorporeal origin."—*Idem*, p. 463.

The following occurrence took place at Naples about eighteen years ago. "Dr. Dionysius Lardner was present at one or two *séances* in the *salon* of Mr. R. Dale Owen, Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the King of Naples. Dr. Lardner retired to the end of an adjoining room, and wrote something on a piece of paper, which he folded up and brought back with him to the table where the medium sat. The alphabet was called for, and after three or four attempts the medium declared that the reply was unintelligible. Mr. Owen proposed recommencing. The same result was repeated a second and a third time, when the medium rose and said it was useless to go on, that such checks

Digitized by Google

occurred sometimes, and that the only thing to do was to break up the *séance*. Dr. Lardner inquired, 'What was it that you obtained?' The medium replied that it was only a few letters which had no sense or signification. Dr. Lardner pressed to know what the letters were. 'Oh,' said the medium, 'there were only B, E, T, A.' Dr. Lardner opened his folded paper, on which was inscribed only the Greek character β [BETA]. Mr. Crookes narrates a yet more striking instance, in which a word in a newspaper which he had covered, without seeing it, with his finger, was correctly written by the planchette." (P. 467.) There could be no collusion in the case recorded by Dr. Lardner.

We must not imagine that Satanic manifestations are found only amongst those who, like the Spiritualists, deliberately plan for the attainment of knowledge or power greater than that with which man is naturally endowed. Whenever men withdraw from God and love darkness rather than light, they bring themselves into circumstances in which the powers of darkness may at any moment be allowed in some form or other, to put forth their strength against them and make them their prey.

The words of the Apostle in 1 Cor. x. 20, justify us in saying that wherever idolatry is practised, devils are worshipped. Amongst idolaters, therefore, the power of Satan may be expected to be peculiarly present; and where it is present, no limitations can be set to its manifestation, save such as may be, in the mercy of God, appointed. Satan

Digitized by Google

can act as an angel of light and bring supernatural, peaceful, soothing, or exhilarating influences to bear upon the soul: or he may, as in Spiritualistic *séances*, cause outward developments that may manifest the presence of supernatural power. When, therefore, a large portion of Christendom became avowedly idolatrous, it might be expected that the same character of supernatural agency that had been found in Paganism, would also be more or less developed in the midst of (so-called) "Christian" idolaters.

Accordingly, if the records of the Romanists are to be believed, we have attestation upon attestation to the constant occurrence of supernatural phenomena among them—phenomena in some cases bearing the strongest resemblance to those that are now found amongst the Spiritualists. The same Evil One who is ready to strengthen philosophic, materialistic Infidelity, has been equally desirous in past ages of aiding idolatrous Sacerdotalism. Accordingly, in the life of St. Philip Neri, translated from the Italian by the late Father Faber, of the Oratory, we are told, "That it was His [the Lord's] good pleasure to exalt him [Philip] to a knowledge of the ineffable secrets of the Divine Greatness in wonderful ecstacies and raptures, which were of frequent occurrence during the whole of his life, although, in his humility, he strove to the utmost to avoid them." (P. 291.)

An abundance of examples are given. "Philip was often seen with his whole body raised in the

Digitized by Google

air: among others, Paulo Spondrato, Cardinal of S. Cecilia, saw him in prayer raised several spans from the ground, indeed, almost to the ceiling, as he told Paul V. a little before his death." p. 295. On one occasion, Philip "was praying in St. Peter's, at the tombs of the Apostles, when his whole body was seen to rise suddenly into the air, with his clothes gathered up as they had been when he was kneeling, and then to descend with equal suddenness." p. 296. "He was repeatedly raised into the air when he was saying mass." *Ibid.* Narratives like these, and yet more wonderful, might be multiplied *ad infinitum.* Two whole chapters of recorded miracles found in the original Italian, are omitted in the English translation; and yet the translation recites enough to weary (I might in respect of some parts say, *disgust*) the reader.*

---

* Philip Neri is said to have foretold the hour of his own death, and also to have predicted the deaths and also the recoveries of various persons. He is also said to have had a power of declaring the secrets of others' hearts. "Sometimes when saying mass he was seen with rays of glory around his head." (P. 297.) Cassandra Raidi says, "I reckoned Father Philip to be a Saint, because the first time I went to S. Giralmo to confess to him, before I had said a word, he told me all my thoughts, and everything that was in my mind, which he could not have done if he had not been a Saint. He used even to tell me what prayers I had said, and the intention for which I had said them." Antonia de Pecorellis says, "Two years before the holy father died while we were talking together, he disclosed to me

Digitized by Google

And now, if I were asked, "Do you believe *all* these tales?" I should answer unhesitatingly, No. I believe the greater part of them to be false. Nevertheless, I should find great difficulty in believing that in an idolatrous system like that of Popery, no examples of supernatural agency were to be found. I believe that enough supernatural power has been, from time to time exhibited, to accredit the system, just as was the case in Paganism of old; and I believe, further, that that supernatural power is of the same generic character as that found among the Spiritualists.

In England, "the Holy Maid of Kent" (as she was called) who was executed in 1533, professed, and evidently believed herself to be inspired; and

---

some of my thoughts which I had never mentioned to him, or told even in confidence to any one. Seeing my heart thus laid open before him, I was overwhelmed with astonishment, and said to myself, 'He could not know this except by Divine revelation;' for they were secrets in my heart. I have never mentioned this to any one, or published it till now. Lastly, not to weary the reader, I may say that the whole of the process bears evidence to this fact, there not being one person who was intimate with Philip who does not affirm that he knew the secrets of his heart; so that in this, more even than in any other gift, we may truly say of him, *Non est inventus similis illi.*" (P. 365.) He is also said to have seen "things that happened at a distance." (P. 341.) Many of these things remind us of what we hear of in Spiritualism; though in the mode of development there may be a difference.

Digitized by Google

her claim to be supernaturally acted on was admitted not only by Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher, who might have been biassed in her favour, but it was admitted also by Archbishop Cranmer. He was not a person likely to come to such a conclusion without well weighing the evidence.

About the year 1520, whilst the Reformation was proceeding under Luther, persons called "The Celestial Prophets," appeared in Germany. Melancthon writing respecting them says, "I see strong reasons for not despising the men; for it is clear to me that there is in them something more than a mere human spirit; but whether the spirit be of God or not, none except Martin [Luther] can easily judge." The Elector called in the advice of some of his most learned counsellors. These could come to no decision. They felt the same doubt that Melancthon had expressed. Luther investigated the circumstances, and said, "I hear of nothing said or done by them which exceeds the imitative powers of Satan. A just application of the Divine Word in the production of true faith, is the only way to correct all bad practices." In 1525, Luther published a treatise against these Prophets, who soon stamped upon themselves the evident and unquestionable seal of delusion by attempting to propagate their tenets by force of arms, and rising against the civil power under which God had placed them.*

* I have extracted the above from an account given by

Digitized by Google

The account given of the French Prophets who appeared in Dauphiny, A.D. 1688, and whose influence afterwards reached England, is still more marvellous and instructive. Dean Goode was not a person who can be suspected of being weakly credulous; he was accustomed carefully to weigh evidence; yet even he accepts the testimony on which the marvellous facts referred to rest. The lesson we learn is that there is no sphere of human life in which our great Enemy cannot, when God permits, operate supernaturally against us. Sometimes he assumes the garb of an angel of light, and acts among those who profess to revere, and many of whom do revere the Word of God: at other times he acts as the Adversary, daringly trampling down even the natural principles of God, and working as the Spirit of darkness amongst the children of darkness. Among the jugglers and idolatries of India we find many awful examples of this. Wherever God's Word is habitually dishonoured and despised,

---

the late Dean of Ripon, Dr. Goode, in his valuable but neglected work, entitled, "The Modern Claims to the Possession of the Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit stated and examined," etc. Hatchards, 1834.

In this important work Dr. Goode has given a detailed account of deluding spiritual manifestations which have occurred from the days of Montanus down to our own times, not only amongst professing, but also amongst real Christians. So manifold and so widely extended is the power of the great Enemy.

Digitized by Google

Satan works more undisguisedly, adapting the mode of his operation to the condition of those whom he assails. The *αλαζονεια* of philosophers and men of science, makes them often his easy prey. When once any are tempted to lift themselves up on the stilts of philosophic arrogance, they are wont to become weak-minded as women. "Professing themselves to be wise they become *fools*." Wherever God is forgotten, and man exalted, Satan reigns.

Whether it may be the intention of Satan after a little to undermine Spiritualism by imposture, and cause a collapse of the system, so as to discredit the thought of the existence of unseen spiritual agency, or whether it be his design to employ Spiritualism for a season, as one of the means by which he quenches the light of truth and invalidates the authority of Scripture, we know not. Possibly he will adopt both methods. If any are disposed to be incredulous and scoff, he will probably seek to increase their scepticism. On the other hand, whenever the existence of spiritual power is believed in, he will earnestly strive to produce the belief that its origin is good, and its influences beneficial. Such, probably, will be his present course. As the end, however, approaches, his servants will be allowed to act more undisguisedly, and "to show great signs and wonders, insomuch that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. xxiv. 24.* As darkness in-

* That which is indicated in this verse is not past, as

Digitized by Google

creases, Satan's strength will be made more and more manifest.

As a general rule we shall do well to remember that whenever we hear of those who profess themselves to have been the subjects of some sudden vivid impression which has become the fixed basis of their subsequent action in life (Ignatius Loyola, a modern Romanist, and others, are examples): or when any suppose themselves to have received peculiar endowments from God, especially when such endowments are said to have been accompanied by sensible manifestations of the presence of supernatural power—in all such cases we have reason to beware. The higher the claim the more rigorously must it be tested. If they who claim these things are not subject, practically and doctrinally, to the Word of God; if in doctrine they fail to show "sound speech that cannot be condemned"; if their relations to Truth and to Error, to Good and to Evil, be not such as beseems those who closely follow Christ, their claims to be accredited of God must be sternly and stedfastly resisted.

Since the days of Montanus to the present hour, I have never read of, or met with, any one who has claimed sensible manifestations of supernatural power, that has not rejected the restraints of Scrip-

---

some have said; it is altogether future. The *unequalled* season of tribulation has not yet passed.

Digitized by Google

ture, and wandered into paths of their own devisings, where they have "laid down in sorrow." The history of Irvingism affords one example of this. The power that really strengthens for God is not such as is found within the circle either of Romanism, or of Mysticism, Spiritualism, or of any other system that is not thoroughly subject to the Word of God.

Systems such as Spiritualism should not only not be tampered with, they should be met with firm and uncompromising antagonism by all who fear God, and reverence His Word. In certain religious conventions, recently held in Brighton and elsewhere, this was not done. Spiritualists, advanced Ritualists, and Universalists, were received, and a place of influence accorded to them. Can we marvel that disastrous results should have followed? Surely in the case of religious meetings and religious Teachers, whenever the slightest suspicion of a tendency towards, or of a tolerance of such a system as Spiritualism is suspected, there should be instant withdrawal on the part of all who reverence and obey the Scriptures. The commandment, "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing," may be disobeyed, but it is too plain to be misunderstood.

NOTE.—In a book entitled, "*Hints on the Evidences of Spiritualism*," a second edition of which has been lately published, there will be found a list of the names of celebrated persons who are said to

Digitized by Google

have given in, more or less decidedly, their adhesion to Spiritualism. In this list occur the names of Archbishop Whately and of Lord Lyndhurst.

I am authorised to state that it is entirely untrue that Archbishop Whately sanctioned Spiritualism. One of his last efforts was to write to a friend a warning against it. "And in private conversation he repeatedly expressed his belief that it *was the same in essentials as the necromancy forbidden in the Bible.*" This was his mature judgment after careful examination of the facts.

As respects Lord Lyndhurst, it may not be generally known that about eighteen months before his death, through reading the Scriptures and through intercourse with a well-known Christian gentleman, now departed, his views respecting divine truth underwent a radical change, and he sought and found refuge in the blood of the Lamb. I am assured by one who has had opportunities of knowing, that after this change, any connection with Spiritualism would have been abhorrent to his soul.

The following is an extract from a Hampshire Journal, Jan. 22nd, 1876:—

"It was noticed the other day that a peer's name, Lord Rayleigh's, appeared among the examiners who are examining candidates for the Cambridge mathematical tripos. Lord Rayleigh is one of our greatest mathematicians, and yet is devoting considerable time to the investigation of

Digitized by Google

spiritualism. He has associated with him two other influential *savans*, one especially very well known at Cambridge. They are going to work in a thoroughly systematic way to investigate the phenomena which are produced by the spiritualist media, and though not committing themselves to the belief in spiritualism, have, I believe, been greatly impressed by the performances which they have witnessed. The most puzzling are those which have been effected when the galvanometer has been used. This instrument is so delicate that it will detect the smallest movement. Yet a medium swathed and bound has been able to untie the fastenings by which she is surrounded without producing the smallest effect upon the galvanometer, though she was in connection with it. One is glad to know that the subject is being thus properly sifted by skilled scientists. This, rather than ridicule, is the right way to approach a phenomena of this kind. I should not be surprised if the enquiries resulted in the discovery of some new force, but I have not the smallest faith that it will have anything to do with the spiritual world."

It is very evident that in all mesmeric and spiritualistic developments, it is required that the persons acted on should resign their wills, divest themselves of their own powers of thought and action, and become passive instruments—tools in another's hand—subjects of another's will. Now, suppose that in natural things, and in religious life, a notion should become prevalent, that the highest condition of man—the path by which he may attain, both naturally and spiritually, a "higher life" is by ceasing from the exercise of those powers of reflection, deliberation, and responsible action which God has given him, and re-

Digitized by Google

signing himself to the control of a power superior to himself, whereby his own powers of thought and action are superseded—what then would become the condition of human life? No power that thus acted could be of Christ; for Christ never acts on those whom He guides, without calling into perpetual action, their understanding, their affections, and their conscience. "I speak," said the Apostle, "unto wise men; judge ye what I say." "The Son of God hath come and given us an understanding," etc. If therefore, there be a power that makes those who are its subjects mere machines, that power cannot be of God, whether its operation be in the spiritual, or in the natural sphere. To forego the exercise of the powers, whether natural or spiritual, which God has given us, and to make ourselves mere machines, is in itself a sin, and a sin of great heinousness. Is there no danger at the present moment, lest they who have accustomed themselves to conversance with such a power in the natural sphere, and familiarised themselves with its developments, and adopted its expressions—is there no danger of such being tempted to introduce like principles into the spiritual sphere? Woe be to the Church if it does not utterly repudiate the counsels of any who have in any way countenanced Spiritualism, especially if such persons speak of having in themselves extraordinary "magnetic power."

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

A.

A LADY well known to me, residing near London, sent me a letter received from America. I requested her to obtain permission for its publication, which has been accorded. I have made a few verbal alterations, which in no way affect the sense.

EXTRACT FROM LETTER.

"March, 1879.

"I wish some day when you have time you would tell me your opinion of Spiritualism. I suppose you have heard to what a fearful extent it is being carried on here. I believe it is all a delusion of the *Devil.** The most extraordinary things have come under my notice lately, of which I should like to tell you.

"Some little time ago, a lady friend of mine asked me to accompany her to see Dr. ———, the celebrated medium, as she had received an anonymous letter, and wished to find out the writer. Neither she nor myself had, or *have*, any faith in this thing. My friend wanted to find out if there

* By this the writer means that Spiritualists have no power of calling up or holding intercourse with the dead. She believes that evil spirits appear who *personate* the dead.

Digitized by Google

was anything in it, and I went with her out of *curiosity*. We both agreed that we would try to expose any fraud, or accomplices.

"We called at the house, and were shown into an ordinary sitting-room in which Dr. ——— sat smoking. He laid aside his pipe, but did not rise from his chair. Silence ensued for a few moments; for we did not introduce ourselves, not wishing to be known. At last he said to my friend, 'I believe you wish to ask me a question.' She merely bowed. Turning to me, he said, 'Madam, you are a sceptic, but before you leave this room, you will be convinced.' I must tell you that it was quite impossible for him to know *who* we were, or *whence* we came, as we live at ———, and he lives away up Town in ———, and had never heard of us, or had any means of getting information about us. To his remark to me I replied by lifting up the table-cover and examining the table all over, and looking round the room. I asked him if he used *leger-demain* or machinery. He gave me an awful scowl, and then looking fixedly behind me, he said, 'Madam, you have lost a relation lately by sudden death. He is standing by your side; a portly man with a beard.' I replied, 'Tell me the manner of his death?' He took a piece of paper, held it under the table for an instant, and then gave it to me *without looking* at it. 'Drowned' was written upon it. 'Tell me his name,' I said. He assumed a *listening* attitude for a moment, and then said, 'Cousin Charles.' 'Can you tell me his surname?' I asked. He again took a scrap of paper, and held it under the table. In a second he gave it to me. 'J——' was written upon it. 'Madam, I see a tall old gentleman with grey hair—*your father*: he wishes to speak to you.' He then gave me some messages, nothing but what Dr. ——— could have made up. 'Tell me his name,' I said. Another scrap of paper was written upon. 'J——— J———, Died in London,' and some other particulars I cannot recall. Dr. ——— then said, 'Madam, you are not yet convinced. Your father wishes to

Digitized by Google

make you aware of his presence by placing his hand upon your shoulder.' I told him *not to let him do it*, as I was beginning to feel a little nervous, though I did not wish him to know it. All at once Dr. ———'s eyes dilated, and he called out, 'A little child, a dear little child, little Harry.' This was more than I could bear. The idea of my darling child being in that room with that dreadful man. I shut my eyes, but two great tears fell with a splash on the table. I asked *where* he died, and a voice answered him, 'St. J——s.' Dr. ——— told me his age, and described him. He said he saw him distinctly. Suddenly he appeared much agitated, and seemed to be struggling with some unseen agency. He then said, 'there is a spirit from *Scotland* here—your first husband.' I held my tongue for I could not speak. Dr. ——— seized a pencil, and began to write furiously. This is what he handed to me as nearly as I can remember, though I brought it home but tore it up after showing it to my husband. 'Rest assured that the dead live, and *can* return to this earth. I am happy and frequently with you, J—— R. Mc——.' The most remarkable thing is that the writing was the same as Mr. Mc———'s. Dr. ——— then asked me if I was still unconvinced, and how I accounted for these manifestations. I told him that it was very mysterious, but in the Bible it was prophesied that in the last days there would be lying spirits abroad which would deceive *many*, and I believed he had *them there*. He sneered when I said the Bible. 'Oh, you believe in the Bible,' he said. He wanted to argue, but I told him I would not argue as he could not shake my faith. He is a well read man. He wanted greatly to make a convert of me. He told me that if I would give myself up to believe this thing I should have immense power. I replied that I did not covet anything of the sort. We asked various questions about different people—in all cases the answers were correct, and my friend found out who wrote the letter. The spirits, or whatever they are, wrote out the

Digitized by Google

name of a neighbour with whom my friend is on bad terms. I must say I felt a little uncomfortable for a few days, and was inclined to look over my shoulder, and run downstairs in a hurry as if something was behind me, but I have prayed earnestly about it, and am more convinced than ever that it is the Devil's work, and that they are all false spirits. My sweet baby would never be allowed to come back to this wicked world."

I have now before me the name of the lady who wrote the letter from which I have extracted the foregoing. All the particulars and names given by Dr. — were strictly correct. Her cousin was drowned in the Princess Alice disaster, and his name was Charles. The name of her infant child who died was Harry. Her first husband had died in Scotland, and his name was correctly given.

Digitized by Google

B.

The following is a statement of Dr. T. L. Nichols, as quoted by Canon Wilberforce, at the recent Church Congress at Newcastle:—

"There can be no question about the marked effect of Spiritualism upon American thought, feeling, and character. Nothing within my memory has had so great an influence. It has broken up hundreds of churches; it has changed the religious opinions of hundreds of thousands; it has influenced, more or less, the most important actions and relations of vast multitudes. Immense numbers of those who, a few years ago, professed a belief in some form of Christianity, or were members of religious organisations, have, under the influence of Spiritualism, modified such profession. Great numbers, perhaps, who doubted or denied the existence of a future state, have found, as they think, incontrovertible proofs of its reality."—"*Spiritualism at the Church Congress*," by M. A., Oxon.

In the Clementine Homilies, belonging probably to the third century, we find a narrative respecting a person much disturbed with doubts about the immortality of the soul. The mode by which he determined to resolve these doubts is described by himself thus:—

"What, then, should I do but this? I will go to Egypt and cultivate the friendship of the hierophants and prophets of the shrines. Then I will inquire for a magician, and, when I have found one, induce him by the offer of a large sum of money to call up a soul from Hades, by the art which is termed necromancy, as though I wished to consult

Digitized by Google

it upon some ordinary matter. But my inquiry shall be to learn whether the soul is immortal. And I shall not care to know the reply of the soul, that it is immortal, from its speaking or my own hearing, but simply by its becoming visible; that, after seeing it with my very eyes, I may have a sufficient and reliable proof of its existence from the mere fact of its appearing. And so the doubtful words which the ears hear will no longer be able to overturn that which the eyes have made their own."*

The same use of Spiritualism is made by sceptics now.

The late Canon Kingsley, in his "Essay on Alexandria and her Schools," gives the following account of the Neo-Platonists, through whose writings that which we call "Neology" has been received amongst us:—

"So they set to work to perform wonders; and succeeded, I suppose, more or less. For now one enters into a whole fairy land of those very phenomena which are puzzling us so now-a-days—ecstacy, clairvoyance, insensibility to pain, cures produced by the effects of what we now call mesmerism. There are all there, these modern puzzles, in those old books of the long byegone seekers for wisdom. It makes us love them, while it saddens us to see that their difficulties were the same as ours, and there is nothing new under the sun."

"But again. These ecstacies, cures, and so forth, brought them rapidly back to the old priestcrafts. The Egyptian priests, the Babylonian and Jewish sorcerers, had practised all this as a trade for ages, and reduced it to an art. It was by sleeping in the temples of the deities, after due mesmeric manipulations, that cures were even then effected. Surely

* See Clem. Hom. as quoted in "Earth's Earliest Ages," p. 180.

Digitized by Google

the old priests were the people to whom to go for information. The old philosophers of Greece were venerable. How much more those of the East, in comparison with whom the Greeks were children? Besides, if these demons and deities were so near them, might it not be possible to behold them? They seemed to have given up caring much for the world and its course—

'Effugerant adytis templisque relictis
Dî quibus imperium steterat.'

The old priests used to make them appear—perhaps they might do it again." *

How thoroughly Spiritualism, in many of its present statements, goes with the temper of the day, may be seen from the following extracts:—

"The special characteristic of Christ, above that of all other delegates of God, was the infinite largeness of soul with which He represented that which is *universal:* the common fatherhood of God—the common brotherhood of man. *It was on this He founded His spiritual kingdom.*

"I do not find that Christ claimed for Himself more than He held out as possible for others. When He identified Himself with the Father, it was in the oneness of mediumship. He was the great Medium or Mediator. His character and life afforded the best portraiture of a God of Love ever made visible in humanity; but this was not as a mocking mirage, a trick of the unattainable, but *a prophecy of what humanity may become.*" †

---

* Kingsley, as quoted in "Earth's Earliest Ages," page 184.

† Gerald Massey, as quoted in "Earth's Earliest Ages," p. 219.

Gerald Massey further says: I cannot help laughing to

Digitized by Google

Again, Gerald Massey says:—

"We talk of believing in the communion of the Holy Spirit, in a vague general way, but what communion could be holier than that betwixt the child on earth, and the spirit of the parent gone before? What form more natural than that could be assumed by the Holy Spirit of God Himself? 'I will send you the Comforter,' said Jesus Christ, and why should not the promise be realized by the bereaved mother through the spirit of that child which she thinks lost to her because she lost sight of the beloved face as it entered the cloud? What more natural than that its presence should brood down on the aching heart, fill the void of its loss, and still the troubled thoughts till the vanished hand can be clasped once more in spiritual unition?"

In the "Westminster Review" (October, 1875) we read:—

"Furthermore, the conception of the Reign of Law, harmonises with the mental fabric of the age, whereas that

---

myself at times as I think of what this much-maligned and despised Spiritualism is about to accomplish. Here are our clergy asserting Sunday after Sunday, in the name of God, any number of things which any number of listeners do not believe, only they have heard them repeated till past all power of impugning—things which they themselves do not believe if they ever come to question their own souls. And here is this new thing in our midst, that is destined to put a new soul into belief, and usher in a resurrection day. It is like watching the grim, black thunder clouds mounting the dead, calm sky with a deliberate haste that makes you hold your breath till they touch the sharp edge of each other." (P. 196.)

Digitized by Google

which it supplants does not. We have ceased to embody the conception of the state in a person, and it is time that we should cease similarly to embody the conception of the universe. Loyalty to a personal ruler is an anachronism in the nineteenth century, but the sentiment which inspired it may find ample satisfaction in disinterested devotion to the welfare of the community."

"In like manner *loyalty to a Divine Person will some day become extinct* as a manifestation of the feeling which ought to sway us in our relations to that whole whereof we form so insignificant a part, but its place will be taken by a conscious and cheerful accordance with the laws which make for the well-being of the universe. We shall transfer to the commonwealth of things that loving allegiance which we were wont to render to the Great King." *

Yet an effort is made to invest these blasphemies with the garb of heavenliness. We have in these things to do with "Devils that speak lies in *hypocrisy*." Mr. Wallace writes thus:—

"The recently discussed question of the efficacy of prayer receives a perfect solution by Spiritualism. Prayer may be often answered, though not directly, by the Deity. Nor does the answer depend wholly on the morality or the religion of the petitioner; but as men who are both moral and religious, and are firm believers in a Divine response to prayer will pray more frequently, more earnestly, and more disinterestedly, they will attract towards them a number of spiritual beings who sympathise with them, and who, when the necessary mediumistic power is present, will be able, as they are often willing, to answer the prayer. A striking case

* "Westminster Review," October, 1875, as quoted in "Earth's Earliest Ages," p. 224.

Digitized by Google

is that of Mr. George Müller of Bristol, who has now for forty years depended wholly for his own support and that of his wonderful charities, on answer to prayer. . . . The spiritualist explains all this as a personal influence. The perfect simplicity, faith, boundless charity, and goodness of George Müller, have enlisted in his cause, beings of a like nature; and his mediumistic powers have enabled them to work for him by influencing others to send him money, food, clothes, etc., all arriving, as we should say, just in the 'nick of time.'"

We cannot wonder that if a lying spirit of old endeavoured to associate himself with Paul, a like attempt should be made with respect to a servant of God now. The prayers which Mr. George Müller offers to God in the name of the Lord Jesus, would attract towards him not the love of the spirit-world (love indeed has no existence there) but their restless and malignant enmity, of which the foregoing paragraph is a sufficient proof.

In 1 Timothy, iv. 1, we read, "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." Devils (not men) are here said to speak "lies in hypocrisy." Among the lies is the forbidding to marry. Remembering this, let the following extracts from the writings of several Spiritualists be considered.

Digitized by Google

"Of all the mischievous inventions blasphemously ascribed to the Almighty, and published in his Word, I doubt if there be one more mischievous and mistaken than the text which asserts that there is no marriage in Heaven."

"I maintain that the churches are entirely in the right in affirming true marriage to be indissoluble: entirely in the wrong in asserting that their own rights are sufficient to constitute a true marriage. It is my firm conviction that affection and affinity are indispensable to an indissoluble marriage, and that animal passions temporarily excited are not reliable indications of these indispensable elements of the true matrimonial relations. I am disposed to think that in a true marriage man and wife are not so much one flesh as virtually one spirit, and one soul—one in time and one for eternity; and I believe that when we begin to elevate the art of mesmerism into the status of a science—the science of soul—we shall begin to understand mysteries of which but the faintest glimmer is now dawning on our intelligence."

"The adventitious sanctity of marriage, derived from ecclesiastical ceremonies, is doomed to be ignored by coming generations. The true sanctity of marriage relations, based on the Divine laws of human nature, must come to be recognised in its place, when the future race are fully initiated in the mysteries of will."—*Idem*, p. 236.

The following extract is also taken from "Earth's Earliest Ages." With many of the statements of that volume I *greatly* differ; but with the author's strong denunciations of Spiritualism in all its forms I cordially unite. He who can read the statements on which the author comments, and not see in them the power of Hell, must indeed be very far removed from Heaven and from God:—

Digitized by Google

"There is before us a book called '*An Angel's Message*,' and claiming to be communications from a spirit (who affirms that he has become an angel) to an English lady, his destined bride for eternity. This awfully blasphemous composition might deceive many by its apparent sanctity, and by the frequent truths with which the strange doctrine is mingled. But let us call to mind the prediction that the deceiving demons should speak lies in hypocrisy: let us remember that he who would press the poisoned cup takes care that the vehicle of his deadly drug shall be good wine. A few extracts from the communications will reveal the abyss to the brink of which the votaries of Spiritualism are apparently hastening, and will force upon us an awful inference."

"The communicating demon describes himself as the spirit of a man of deep religious feeling, who, during his sojourn in the flesh, was accustomed to visit the house of the medium's father, though at that time he found no attraction in the medium herself. In course of years he died, as did also the mother of the lady. Soon after the decease of the latter, her daughter began to receive communications understood to come from her, and among them the following, with which we are at present concerned:—

"'I have seen how happy I have made you by all that has been written. Love and bless Him who has shown you, dear J—, that you have some one that loves you here. Dear W— sees that you love his memory. He sees that, before I told you of his love for you, my dear child had always thought him a very high spirit; but now that I have been permitted to tell her, she will be sure to believe it is indeed true.'

"'I shall now tell you more about W—. I see that this opens your heart to him who loves you more than I can tell you. For he is your own W—; he is your conjugal partner, the one heaven has intended for you from all eternity. I see that you are now thankful that you never formed any connection in the world.'

Digitized by Google

"'I will now tell you what will give you great confidence. W— himself will write through you in his own hand.'

"'I see that I have given you great happiness. I have no more to say. When you begin again W— will write through you.'"

Henceforth the demon lover inspired the medium, and after a little hypocritical talk about her faults and their remedy, got rid of the difficulty of our Lord's declaration that in Heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage, by remarking that the Sadducees asked their question in a natural sense, and that the Lord answered them in the same way.

"'For in the world a woman may have seven husbands and yet not one of them may be spiritually united to her. There may have been no union of the soul with any of the seven, or there may have been with one, but with one only; and she shall surely be his wife in heaven and none other. 'They twain shall be one flesh, and let no man put them asunder.'

"The reader will not fail to notice the daring misapplication of the texts quoted, as well as the inference which is thereby suggested. So are God's barriers of morality being broken down, that the flood of corruption may rush in.

"'She who writes these lines is my wife more than may be thought possible by those who have not had a similar state opened in themselves. She is not so as to her natural body, but she is so as to her spiritual body. For 'there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.' The one is within the other as a kernel within a shell.'

Digitized by Google

"'But this state can come to the outward perception of those only who are open to spirit intercourse. No others can perceive, during their life in the world of nature, that which belongs to the spirit alone. This state constitutes mediumship; for she who is mine is not only a writing medium, but she is also susceptible of very palpable impressions of my presence with her. We are one; and she has received the assurance of that truth by other means than the merely being told so in these writings.'

"There is much more to the same effect; but that which we have quoted is sufficient to unveil the danger which is threatening many. We will only further show what form manifestations often take by extracting the subjoined account of intercourse between the medium and the demon represented to be the spirit of her mother:—

"'She has received the ardent caresses of her loved spirit-mother when in a state for open communion; but this was also before her writing mediumship commenced On one occasion the visitation was preceded by the appearance of a white dove of very brilliant aspect, sitting on an eminence and looking towards her. She calmly contemplated this vision and remarked to herself how beautiful it was; being perfectly awake—yet her bodily eyes were sealed, so that she could not open them, though earnestly desiring to do so. On the disappearance of the dove she was palpably embraced, but she saw no form: her spirit-eye could see the dove, but not the angelic being who then approached her. Well did she know it was the spirit of her she loved, for I was then unknown to her. Plainly did she perceive that ardent sphere of love; palpably did she feel the living breath; clearly did she hear the whispering voice—but could not catch the words it uttered, for her spirit-ear was not sufficiently opened—rapidly did that angel form pass over her passive frame, and she opened her eyes to the world of nature, filled with the tears of joy, for well she knew that it was an angelic visitation. She has also received kisses on her

Digitized by Google

forehead, when so fully awake that she has asked if they might be repeated, and they were repeated as plainly as before; the feeling being precisely as though her brow were pressed by human lips, though none were in the room with her. She has felt drops of crystal water fall on her forehead, and has also asked if it might be repeated, which was done. These latter cases occurred when she was perfectly awake, for in the last instance she was about to rise, as the morning sun warned her it was already day.'"

When we remember all that the Scripture reveals respecting the mighty and terrible power of Satan; how he was permitted to enter Paradise, to possess himself of the body of a serpent, and so to hold converse with Eve; how he controlled the lightnings and the winds of heaven, and brought down destruction on the household of Job; how he strengthened Jannes and Jambres to resist Moses; how one of the spirits that serve him went forth to be a lying spirit in the mouth of the prophets of Ahab; how Satan was allowed to bear the Lord of glory from place to place, setting Him at one moment on the pinnacle of the Temple, at another on an exceeding high mountain, and shewing Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time; how devils were allowed to speak audibly to the Lord Jesus, and to say, "We know Thee who Thou art;" how at Philippi, and elsewhere, devils were allowed to speak in the ears of men — when we consider these, and like things, so distinctly revealed in the Scripture respecting the Prince of the authority

Digitized by Google

of the air, how is it that such scepticism prevails as to the ability of men to bring themselves (when God permits) into connexion with the unseen world of spiritual evil which environs them on every side?

The truth is that the Teachers of Christendom have been for centuries under a deadly spell. They have slumbered and dreamt an evil dream. They have imagined that at the Cross the empire of Satan ceased; that he was then bound and cast into the bottomless pit; that when Satan is spoken of as the god of this age, the age referred to is not the present age, but that which preceded the Cross.* Such has been for ages the current doc-

---

* See further observations on this subject in "Aids to Prophetic Enquiry," pp. 310—386, as advertised at end.

In "The Speaker's Commentary," just published, we find such a statement as the following:—

"Satan is called the 'god of this age' (αιον), because the period preceding the Saviour's advent was regarded as one of extreme wickedness, and peculiarly under Satan's dominion."

Subsequently, indeed, in a paragraph written apparently by another hand, this statement is qualified thus:—

"N.B. There is much in favour of the view that the 'age' meant in the title, 'god of this age,' began with the time when Satan brought sin into the world through the first Adam, thereby gaining dominion over men, and a power of blinding them in divine truth. . . . For the restriction of αιων to the period immediately preceding Christ's Advent, see Grimm Lex."

This, no doubt, is intended to qualify the preceding statement. But qualified statements on such a subject

Digitized by Google

trine of Christendom, and even evangelical teachers have fallen into the snare. Of this there has been a notable example lately.

Satan, no doubt, has found it needful when acting in Christendom to assume the garb of an angel of light but his deceptions have been, on that very account, more deadly. The Dispensation in which we live is, at its close, to manifest the power of Satan more terribly and destructively than any that have preceded it; and yet there is no Dispensation in which there has been so great a tendency to ignore the power of Satan, and even to question the fact of his existence. How little is it realized that he continues to be that which he ever has been, the Accuser of the brethren "accusing them before our God day and night." How little is he recognised as "Prince of the power of the air," having legions of spirits under his control? How little is it believed that yet a little while and there will be war in heaven; that Michael and his angels will fight with the dragon and his angels, and that Satan will cease to be the accuser of the brethren, and that he will come down to earth "having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time;" that he will give to the last great Monarch of the Roman World his throne and great

---

are really more to be dreaded than outspoken ones. He who hesitates to say whether Satan is, or is not, the god of this present age, does thereby divest himself of all title to be a Teacher in the Church of God.

Digitized by Google

authority, and will cause the world to wonder after and worship him; that spirits of devils working miracles will go forth to deceive the kings of the whole οἰκουμενη, and "gather them to the battle of the great day of God Almighty." Have these things been believed? Have they been incorporated into the teaching of Christendom? Have they not been systematically denied, or else buried out of sight? If the people of God are in no danger of being deceived by the utterances of unclean spirits, why are we specifically warned against that spirit of Antichrist which is to come, and told not to believe "every spirit," but "to try the spirits whether they be of God?" Do we not know that well-nigh in every century during the last eighteen hundred years even the true servants of God have again and again been endangered, and not unfrequently ensnared, by the agency of lying spirits? Of this the book of Dean Goode, to which I have already referred, affords abundant evidence.

Various are the motives by which men are led to connect themselves with the unseen spiritual world. Distress, despair, and a consciousness of being abandoned by God, impel some to seek supernatural aid in another than God. So was it with Saul in the day of his calamity: so will it be in the closing hour of anti-Christianism, when men finding nothing but darkness and terror, dimness of anguish, either in the heavens above, or in the earth, shall turn to necromancy and sorcery for counsel and aid. See the fearful picture of this given at the close of

Digitized by Google

Isaiah viii. Others, tempted by ambition or covetousness, have desired supernatural power, and supernatural knowledge, that they may increase their influence, or augment their wealth. The desire of spiritual authority and power has been the bait by which many have been lured into circumstances in which they have found themselves brought under the influence of a supernatural power that is not of God. Others, eager after every thing that gratifies their curiosity and love of excitement, turn to table-turning, Planchette, and the like, as a pastime; and whilst witnessing results which they knew to be beyond the scope of human power and human knowledge, scoff at the thought of the presence of supernatural power. To seek thus to the powers of darkness, in unholy levity of heart, seems something even more fearful than the being driven to them in anguish and distress.

Let no one, however, imagine that the powers of darkness can really raise the dead, or temporarily separate the soul of a living person from his body. Satan has no such power. The pretended apparitions of the dead are simply the result of personation. Evil spirits can personate the dead, but they have no power to bring back their spirits to earth, much less to raise their bodies from the grave. That power belongs to God alone.

Finally, let none tamper with these abominations under the pretence of wishing to convince themselves of the possibility of the agency of unclean spirits. Scripture and recorded facts in every age

Digitized by Google

attest its possibility. To reject such attestation is to court destruction. There are certain circles sanctified by the Word of God and prayer, in which the power of God operates for preservation and for blessing; there are other in which the power of the Devil is as distinctly present. He who carelessly ventures into the charmed circle of evil may find himself caught in the snare of the fowler, and, it may be, will never escape again. It is well to remember the words, "Lead us not into temptation."

The following note should have been appended to page 33. *It will be seen how the experience of Livingstone confirms that of Brainerd. Dr. Livingstone says :—*

"Suleiman-ben-Juma lived on the main land, Mosessamé, opposite Zanzibar. It is impossible to deny his power of foresight, except by rejecting all evidence, for he frequently foretold the deaths of great men among the Arabs, and he was pre-eminently a good man, upright and sincere—'Thisti,' none like him now for goodness and skill. He said that two middle-sized white men, with straight noses and flowing hair down to the girdle behind, came at times and told him things to come. He died twelve years ago, and left no successor; he foretold his own decease, three days beforehand, by cholera."

Digitized by Google

Appointments of God

IN JUDGMENT AND IN MERCY

CONSIDERED.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

London:

LONDON

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,

12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.1.

PHONE—CITY 4488.

MDCCCXCV.

Digitized by Google

RYDE:

PRINTED BY F. W. SARGENT,

CHURCH LANE.

Digitized by Google

Appointments of God,

ETC., ETC.

§ I.

"THE WORKS OF THE LORD ARE GREAT, SOUGHT OUT OF ALL THEM THAT HAVE PLEASURE THEREIN."—Ps. cxi. If this be true of His works of Creation, how much more of His ways in Redemption! All who are wise with the wisdom of God will seek increase in that wisdom, cleaving to the instructions of Holy Scripture. At the same time we must remember that God is incomprehensible. Even with all the powers of apprehension that He may be pleased to communicate to us, either naturally or by the Holy Ghost, we are still utterly unable adequately to comprehend Him or His distinctive attributes. Eternal self-existence is an example. We are utterly unable to conceive of eternal, uncreated, self-existent Being. According to all the laws of being with which *we* are acquainted, self-existence is an impossibility. It is a necessary characteristic of the

Digitized by Google

being of God. Therefore our first duty is to believe what God declareth, simply on the ground that He doth declare it. Although God intends to give us knowledge and to increase it, the knowledge He so gives us is limited by His will. His Written Word determines its scope. Beyond that Word we dare not go. By that Word all our thoughts and all our investigations are to be directed, as well as checked and tested. And even if our knowledge should be matured, if we should have apprehended all that can now be apprehended in the School of God, we should have still to say that our knowledge is imperfect—that "we know only in part, and prophesy in part." Our highest and most extended knowledge is infantile, limited in scope, and partial in character; and so it must continue till that great coming hour of change comes, in which all that pertains to the form and fashion of the First Adam is to be changed for another condition of regenerate being—regenerate according to the likeness of Christ the Second Man, the Last Adam, when revealed in glory. When John, the beloved Disciple, strengthened, and that miraculously by the Spirit, was, whilst yet possessed of his Adamic being, taken into the presence of his Lord in glory, he was unable to act or think in the presence of that glory; he became as one dead. But it shall be otherwise when he shall awake in the glory of the First Resurrection, changed into the like-

Digitized by Google

ness of his Lord. John shall then see Him as He is. Imperfectness will attach to the condition of all saints until then. What words can be more express than those of the Apostle Paul? "Whether there be prophecies they shall fail, whether there be tongues they shall cease, whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away; for we know in part and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come then that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known."—1 Cor. xiii. 12. Plain and simple are these words. Are they written that they should be spurned, or that they should be believed and reverenced? The right effect of knowledge is to humble. Israel in the next dispensation will have light, knowledge, and grace, far greater than we; and what will be the result as to their condition? Read the words of Psalm cxxxi. The lips of Israel will use those words: the hearts of Israel will feel them. "Lord, my heart is not haughty, nor mine eyes lofty, neither do I exercise myself in great matters, or in things too high for me. Surely I have behaved myself as a child weaned of his mother. My soul is even as a weaned child. Let Israel hope

Digitized by Google

in the Lord from henceforth, and for ever." The meekness and humility of Israel then will stand in marked contrast with the pride and self-sufficiency which has for ages characterised even true Gentile Christianity, "wise in its own conceits." The present condition of both Jew and Gentile would almost seem to indicate that humility and reverent fear of God had departed from the earth. Arrogant self-confidence prevails. Men say, "Our lips are our own, who is Lord over us?" And "their tongue walketh through the earth." Rebellion against God more concentrated, systematised and virulent than ever yet has been, is arising around us. If we are blind to the tokens of this night of nights we may almost be said to be devoid of ability to distinguish between evil and good. The inspired servants of God from Enoch, the seventh from Adam, onward, have warned us of this great, and now near, apostasy. On this account it is the more needful to watch our thoughts, our ways, and our associations. If we sanction even indirectly the voice of the scoffer, and sit in judgment on the ways, or on the words of God, and venture in any wise to reply against Him, we have need to tremble. Danger of being swept away by the rising torrent is imminent, and it is a danger from which none but God can deliver. We should do well to consider the words of Jude, which bear especially on this present hour. "But ye, beloved, building up

Digitized by Google

yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life." And now observe the momentously important words that follow; they show the vast importance of discriminative judgment:—"And some, when they dispute, convict; others save, snatching them out of the fire; others pity with fear, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh."

I follow here the ancient reading as given by Tregelles. *Διακρινομαι* is evidently used in the Middle Voice. For the use of *Διακρισις* and *διακρινομαι*, see *Liddell & Scott.*

Digitized by Google

§ II.

Bearing these things in mind let us endeavour with reverence and deep submission of soul, to consider what God has written respecting the past, and present, and future circumstances of our being. His Written Word, as I have already said, defines the scope and limit of our investigations. We must not go beyond it, we must not fall short of it. "By the words of thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer."

Man when first created was only acquainted with GOOD. Evil he knew not. He was, to use the language of Scripture, "upright;" capable therefore of walking righteously, that is, in strict conformity with the commandments given to him by God, no counteracting principle of evil being in him. He was, however, as to his capacities, and powers, and the sphere of his existence, made lower than the angels—unearthly beings who were created before him with powers suited to act in the presence of God in heaven. Nevertheless, the angels and man resembled each other in this, that they were alike innocent, and that both had capacity suited to their respective spheres, enabling them to render perfect

Digitized by Google

obedience to Him who had created them. In respect of innocency and righteousness there was no difference in the original condition of angels and of man. Sin was unknown both in heaven and in earth.

But, suddenly in heaven, Sin entered. God permitted it. In saying this we say all that we can rightly say. We silence our vain thoughts, and allow that all that God permits must be right because He permits it. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" For the proof of this we wait until the hour of perfectness comes, when we shall know even as we are known. Imperfect beings cannot duly apprehend perfect explanations. We are commanded therefore to wait, and stedfastly to say, "Let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and overcome when thou judgest." Is it not reasonable that God should ask beings such as we to wait?

To some of the angels (not those who are described as elect, see 1 Tim. v. 21) unrestrained freedom of will was given, as to Adam afterwards in Paradise; they used that freedom, disobeyed, and fell. No sin was in them when created; no constraint was placed on them. They were allowed to follow the promptings of their own hearts, and they fell. Knowingly and spontaneously they cut themselves off from God. Little is revealed respecting the nature or the cause

Digitized by Google

of their sin. We are told they "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation," and also that pride brought Satan into his condemnation, but what stimulated that pride we know not. Some indeed have surmised that the appointment in eternity of God the Son to the predestined headship of a new race of beings who, though created lower than the angels, were eventually to be raised above them, and to reign in heavenly life in union with their Head, caused Satan's heart to rebel. We know indeed that a promise of life in Christ Jesus was made in heaven to elect men before the world was. This was unquestionably known to Satan; but whether or not this knowledge prompted his rebellion we know not, for Scripture is silent, and therefore we can affirm nothing. The Lord Jesus speaking of a period antecedent to the creation of the Adamic universe said, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven;" but He speaks not of the reason of that fall.

When the earth was created Satan was permitted to enter it and tempt Eve, and through Eve, Adam. Shall we ask why did not God prevent this? Or shall we bridle our vain thoughts and say, If it had been right and wise for us to know, God would surely have told us? He asks us to trust in His goodness, and to confide in His wisdom, and to wait. Is this an unreasonable demand on creatures such as we?

Digitized by Google

Do we need no schooling, no discipline, no exercise of our conscience, no trial of our faith? Is it not meet that we should trust God's truthfulness and love when His explanations to us are partial, quite as much as when they are complete?

As respects the mode of the creation of the angelic world it is necessary to observe that it differed materially from that employed in the creation of man. The angels had no federal head, nor did they spring from one progenitor. They were created as a race, each perfect in his own individual condition, no distinction existing among them such as separated Adam into his place of federal headship, but only such differences as were governmental and official, depending on the arrangements of God. They had a governmental head, for we read of the Archangel Michael, but he was not a representative head as Adam was. Men were not created as the angels were. Men were born from a progenitor, and that progenitor was appointed to be the federal representative of the race, so that the retention or forfeiture of the blessings given to man in Paradise was made to depend on the faithfulness or unfaithfulness of their first parent to God. I need not say that Adam was unfaithful, and so Paradise was lost, and all creation subjected to the bondage of corruption. Results that have affected heaven and earth, and all created things, have sprung from the transgression of Adam

Digitized by Google

—the transgression which he committed whilst he was the federal head of his race. These results we shall have to consider in detail, taking Scripture only as our guide. Our first question shall be, what does Scripture teach respecting the primary and originating sin. Next we shall have to consider what have been its effects, and what remedial agents have been appointed by God. Here again I would say, let us seek to have the spirit of weaned children, asking no curious questions, but submitting ourselves to the authority of God.

Digitized by Google

§ III.

The act of disobedience which Adam committed in Paradise affected not himself only. A legal oneness had been by divine appointment established between Adam and all his natural descendants. In Paradise Adam was a REPRESENTATIVE person. His race was headed up in him. What he forfeited, they whom he represented forfeited. The guilt incurred by him was equally incurred by them. *His* transgression was imputed to them.

The following statements found in the fifth chapter of the Romans are so plain that they scarcely require comment. They teach that Adam brought ruin on us not by himself becoming corrupt and transmitting by generation that corruption to us (though this he did), but that he ruined us by one definite act of transgression committed by himself before we had any being. I will now quote the texts to which I refer.

Romans v. 12. "By means of one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death penetrated unto all men on the ground that all sinned." *Δι' ἑνος ανθρωπου ἡ ἁμαρτια εις τον κοσμον εισηλθεν, και δια της ἁμαρτιας ὁ θανατος,*

Digitized by Google

*και οὑτως εις παντας ανθρωπους ὁ θανατος διηλθεν, εφ' ᾧ παντες ἡμαρτον.**

Romans v. 15. "By means of the offence of the one the many died." *Τῳ του ἑνος παραπτωματι οἱ πολλοι απεθανον.*

Romans v. 17. "By the offence of one, death reigned through the one." *Τῳ του ἑνος παραπτωματι ὁ θανατος εβασιλευσεν δια του ἑνος.*

Romans v. 18. "By means of one offence judgment came unto all men unto condemnation." *Δι'*

---

* The greater part of the subsequent note was published by me many years ago in one of my former publications.

The *εφ' ᾧ* of verse 12 is as much a legal or forensic expression as is *καθιστημι* or *δικαιοω*. It may be used either of a stipulation referring to the future, in which sense it is often used by Thucydides, as when one person covenants to do so and so, *on condition that* (*εφ' ᾧ*) the other shall do so and so; or it may be used of an arrangement that has taken effect, as when we say, "You are deprived of your inheritance *on the ground of* (*εφ' ᾧ*) your forefathers having been guilty of treason." In the first case we commonly translate *εφ' ᾧ on condition that;* in the latter case, *on the ground that.*

See a quotation from "Menander apud Plutarch vi. 391 *ει γαρ εγενου—εφ' ᾧ γε διατελειν—διευτυχων αει,* Si enim ea lege natus es, at perpetua felicitate fruaris," as given by Stephanus, in Thesaurus, under *επι.*

See also a passage in Demosthenes as quoted by Jelf (Grammar. § 634, *επι,* antecedent cause or occasion)—*εφ' αἱματι φευγειν,* applied to a person flying on the ground of blood having been shed. Also Luke v. 5 (referred to also by Jelf), where Peter says to the Lord *επι τῳ ρηματι σου*—on the ground of what thou hast spoken I will let down the net. This text does not use it forensically, but it distinctly illustrates the meaning of *εφ' ᾧ* when it is so used. Rom. v. 12 is rendered in the margin of our Bible, "in whom." If the Apostle had meant that, it would have read *εν ᾧ.*

Digitized by Google

ἑνος παραπτωματος εις παντας ανθρωπους εις κατακριμα.

Romans v. 19. "By means of the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners." *Δια της παρακοης του ἑνος ανθρωπου ἁμαρτωλοι κατεσταθησαν οἱ πολλοι.*

These passages distinctly prove that the sin which Adam committed in Paradise, was not only *original* in the sense of *primary*, but that it was also an *originating* sin, for it originated our condemnation, and caused us to be born "children of wrath." This fact gives an awful pre-eminence to Adam's first sin. That sin became the root of ruin. I must, in speaking of it, be allowed to use the expression "Originating Sin." By that term I mean that first transgression of Adam under the imputation of which we are born into this world.

The ascription of this transgression necessarily involves the ascription of its *demerit*. This is termed Original Guilt.

On this imputed Guilt follows *condemnation* and adjudgment to *penalties* temporal and eternal. This may be termed Original Condemnation. This condemnation is ante-natal. We are born "children of wrath."

One of the immediate penalties attaching to Original Guilt is adjudgment to the possession of a fallen and corrupt condition of being, both physical

Digitized by Google

and moral. Our moral natural condition is one of unqualified enmity to God. "In our flesh no good thing dwelleth"; "the mind of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." This is called Original Corruption or Sinfulness. It is the result, not the cause, of the Original Condemnation caused by the Originating Sin of Adam.

Every attempt therefore to regard our Original Corruption as being wholly or in part a ground of our Original Condemnation, must be resisted as dangerously and heretically false. The ground of our primary condemnation is found wholly in the act of *another*—an act entirely external to ourselves. The depravation of our nature is a resulting consequence and penalty of that act of *another*—an act with which we were wholly unconnected in the way either of co-operation, or concurrence, or consciousness.

It is therefore a most serious deficiency in our Protestant Confessions of Faith that we have no satisfactory definition of that which I have termed Originating Sin. The English Articles give a very satisfactory definition of Original Corruption or Sinfulness (which they have termed Original Sin), but they have given no definition of THE Sin whence that Original Corruption springs. They confound cause and effect. The Ninth Article is this:—

Digitized by Google

Of Original or Birth-sin.

"Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is gone as far as possible from [*quam longissime*] original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit: and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek, *phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are regenerate [*renatis*], yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin."

There is a definition of Original sinfulness in this Article, but there is no definition of that Originating Sin of Adam whose imputation caused the impartation of corruption to our nature.

An attempt was made by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster in 1643, to supply this deficiency. The Article as revised by them commences thus:—

Digitized by Google

"Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam as the Pelagians do vainly talk, but *together with his first sin imputed*, is ALSO the fault and corruption of our nature."

This is certainly an acknowledgment of Adam's Originating Sin, but it is so acknowledged as really to involve a heresy. It virtually makes Adam's sin and our corruption to be joint causes of our condemnation, and does not recognise our corruption as being a penal consequence of Adam's first sin. Dr. Owen evidently discovered this error, and his statement is thoroughly Scriptural. Speaking of the text, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," he observes: "It is hence manifest what sin it is that the Apostle intends, namely, the actual sin of Adam—the one sin of that common person while he was so. For although the corruption and depravation of our nature doth necessarily ensue thereon, in every one that is brought forth actually in the world by natural generation, *yet it is the guilt of Adam's actual sin alone* that rendered them all obnoxious unto death upon the first entrance of sin into the world." *Works, vol.* 5, *p.* 324, Goold's edition.

The danger of error on this important subject can scarcely be over-rated. The true doctrine of Justification as taught in Scripture is undermined if false doctrine is taught respecting the consequence of the

Digitized by Google

imputation of the first sin of Adam. The Scripture establishes a parallel between the federal relation of Adam to those of whom he was the representative, and the federal relation of Christ—the Second Man, to those of whom He is the representative. Christ was the appointed Representative of the elect family of faith; they consequently are entitled to say, "We are accounted righteous before God ONLY on account of the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ." As by the disobedience of the one man we were constituted sinners, so by the obedience of One, and by that alone, are believers constituted righteous. We must strike out the word *only*, and so invalidate all these blessed declarations respecting our salvation by the imputed value of Christ's Sacrificial obedience alone, if we were to admit that Adam's transgression imputed, and Adam's corruption imparted, were jointly the ground of our condemnation. The Scripture teaches otherwise. Christ's personal obedience, commenced at His birth and finished at His death, is the sole ground of our justification. It alone supplies our title to life. All that follows in the way of impartation, whether in time or in eternity, is only an effect resulting from the imputation of the value of the One Obedience. As there is an Originating Sin, so likewise is there an Originating Righteousness. Woe to him who destroys or invalidates either!

Digitized by Google

§ IV.

Before we consider the appointments of God's grace in rescuing from the consequences of Adam's sin, it may be well to remind ourselves of the unspeakably awful character of those consequences, especially with reference to eternity.

The immediate consequences affected not merely Adam and his posterity, but also extended to the created universe, involving not only the earth and all that is within it, but extending to the created heavens also; all being subjected to the bondage of corruption as well as to that final sentence of destruction that will be executed on them all as soon as the history of this Adamic earth ends. The first heavens, as well as the first earth, will pass away and no place be found for them; and He that sitteth on the throne shall say, "Behold I make all things new."

Accordingly, as soon as Adam by his transgression had broken the link which connected the created heavens and earth in blessedness with God, their perfect Paradisiacal condition terminated. A curse was inflicted on the earth; "Cursed be the ground

Digitized by Google

for thy sake." The animals which had been created peaceful and perfect, began to prey on each other. Disease and famine threatened them: death and physical corruption, unknown in the Paradisiacal earth, spread over all things—plants, beasts, fishes, birds, fields and trees; all creation was subject to the bondage of corruption, and groaned. The earth which had been created in beauty and perfectness—everything in it being very good, was at the Fall stricken with the stroke of judgment so that destructive agencies, unknown before, began to operate on and in it. Sheol, or Hades, was created in the earth's centre, and consuming fires raged destructively where previously destruction was unknown. Awful indeed is the condition of the earth physically when viewed in the light of revealed Truth. As regards the celestial part of creation we know virtually nothing as to the degree and manner in which it has been affected by the Fall. That it is intimately bound up with the destiny of the earth is, as I have already said, proved by the fact that when the existence of the Adamic earth terminates, the created heavens will likewise pass away, and be as though they had not been. Moreover, we know that Satan, "the World-wide Ruler," (ὁ κοσμοκρατωρ), of the darkness of this present age, is not, as to the sphere of his operations, limited to earth. He is called the Prince or Ruler of the authority of the air; the

Digitized by Google

spirits that are with him and under him being fallen angels, and therefore unfettered by those physical laws of matter that restrict the actions of man. It is said of God in relation to the angelic world that "He maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." With lightning-like rapidity Satan was able, under God's permission, to direct the fires and winds of heaven against Job's household. He was able also to bear the Lord Jesus through the air to a high mountain, and to show Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. We know also that in the days of Job, and at the present time likewise, he was, and is, permitted to enter heaven as the accuser of God's people. "He accuseth them before our God day and night," Rev. xii. 10. Evil spirits also with whom the family of faith wrestle, are said to be in heavenly places. "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness [wickedness found in wicked spiritual beings] above the heavens." All this, and other like things, show that Satan's power in consequence of and connection with human sin, is not limited to earth. When we know as we are known we shall understand this more fully than now. Solemn thoughts should rest upon our souls in connection with this unearthly agency of Satan. Man is under the responsibility of

Digitized by Google

having by his sin brought Satan into the possession of this awful power.

But of all the results of the Fall those which affect ourselves personally are the most awful. Not only have we been cast out of Paradise into an earth cursed for our sake,—all creation groaning in the bondage of corruption, ourselves groaning also, and having to learn by bitter experience that "there is no good thing under the sun," that "all is vanity and vexation of spirit," and that "man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward"—not only is our external condition marked by circumstances such as these, but what is worse, our own personal condition is one of utter moral distance from God. Sin (which though not a person, is in the Scripture personified) has like an unclean demon entered into us, and taken possession of our entire being in body, soul, and spirit. All our powers and endowments, moral, intellectual, and physical (however excellent they originally were), are all now under the control of Sin who stands as master at the helm in close alliance with Satan, and in ceaseless active hostility to God. Accordingly, we are declared in Scripture to be "children of wrath." To man (who is found as soon as born to be already morally dead to God) physical death also is "appointed." Indeed as soon as he is born, death, physical death, begins to work in him; perfectness of health is unknown. Death

Digitized by Google

is appointed to him, and after death judgment, when he will have to give an account for every idle word, and every foolish thought. Hebrews ix. 27. From that awful judgment the family of faith are alone delivered, even all who have fled for refuge to the One oblation perfected in the sacrificial death of Jesus. How full and blessed are His words: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and SHALL NOT COME INTO JUDGMENT, but hath passed from death unto life," John v. 24. Blessed indeed are they who have found this refuge; but all who find it not—all who shall be brought as criminals before God's Judgment Seat, to be there arraigned and judged according to their works, must know the second death, even everlasting torment, where "THEIR worm dieth not, and where the fire is not quenched." We dare not face, even in thought, that dread reality. What if there were no Second Man who had become the Lamb slain? The door of hope is not yet closed; Grace, saving through the imputed righteousness of Another, is still preached. "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever desireth, let him take the water of life freely." Rev. xxii. 17.

Digitized by Google

§ V.

It is an unspeakable relief to turn from the consideration of the awful destiny appointed to those who remain in association with the curse that flows from Adam's headship, to the consideration of the blessedness vouchsafed to those who through faith in Jesus are brought under His representative headship as the Second Man—the Last Adam. "Last" is a blessed word, one that indicates everlasting continuance. If His headship be everlasting, so also will be the blessings that flow from it.

In eternity before the world was (and consequently before Adam sinned) Christ in the counsels of God was appointed to this headship. Accordingly, we read that eternal life in Christ Jesus was promised before the world began. See Titus i. 2, and 2 Tim. i. 1. We also read in Ephesians i. 4, that God "chose us in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world"; and twice we read in the Revelation of "names written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that

Digitized by Google

hath been slain."* Consequently, all whom the Father hath given to the Son (see John xvii.) were appointed to have a legal oneness with Christ, even as they had naturally an appointed legal oneness with Adam. And as it was pre-ordained that Adam, when he committed his first act of disobedience, should thereby entail on all to whom legal oneness with himself had been appointed (that is on all his natural seed) the imputation or ascription of the guilt of his first transgression,—so also it was predestined that Christ by His sinless obedience (perfected in judicial and sacrificial death), should thereby entail on all who were by God appointed to have legal oneness with Him, the ascription of the value of His righteous service. What can be more plain than the testimony of the following Scriptures?

"The judgment is of one offence unto condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification."—Romans v. 16. *Το μεν γαρ κριμα εξ ἑνος εις κατακριμα, το δε χαρισμα εκ πολλων παραπτωματων εις δικαιωμα.*

"If by the offence of the one, death reigned by means of the one, much more they who receive the superabounding of grace and of the gift of

* The translation of Rev. xiii. 8, should be amended in the manner here given. Christ is said to be "the Lamb fore-ordained," but He is not said to have been slain from the foundation of the world

Digitized by Google

righteousness, shall reign in life by the One, Jesus Christ."—Ver. 17. *Ει γαρ τῳ του ἑνος παραπτωματι ὁ θανατος εβασιλευσεν δια του ἑνος, πολλῳ μαλλον οἱ την περισσειαν της χαριτος και της δωρεας της δικαιοσυνης λαμβανοντες εν ζωῃ βασιλευσουσιν δια του ἑνος Ιησου Χριστου.*

"As by the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners, so by the obedience of the One Man shall the many be constituted righteous." —Ver. 19. *Ὡσπερ γαρ δια της παρακοης του ἑνος ανθρωπου ἁμαρτωλοι κατεσταθησαν οἱ πολλοι, οὑτως και δια της ὑπακοης του ἑνος δικαιοι καταστηθονται οἱ πολλοι.*

These, and other like texts, sufficiently show that if Adam's first transgression became the Originating Sin, entailing on all who are under its imputation (unless its operation be arrested) the penalty of the second death,—so Christ's perfect obedience in life and in sacrificial death became an Originating Righteousness, giving to all who are brought through faith into connection therewith a sure title unto everlasting glory.

And as the imputation of Adam's transgression, (although pre-appointed to all who come under his headship) does not either manifestly or consciously affect any until they have been naturally quickened and brought by natural birth into personal association with Adam's fallen condition of being,—so the

Digitized by Google

imputation of Christ's obedience does not manifestly or consciously affect any who are not (by being spiritually quickened) brought into actual association with Christ in that condition of blessed spiritual being that pertains unto Him.

And as all who are brought by natural birth avowedly and manifestly under the ascription of Adam's transgression, stand avowedly under the ascription of its DEMERIT: so all who are by spiritual birth brought under the ascription of Christ's obedience, do there stand avowedly under the ascription of its infinite MERIT.

And as they who stand under the ascription of Adam's demerit are thereby brought under avowed CONDEMNATION, and have therefore adjudicated to them all the penalties that do to that demerit attach: so they who through faith stand under the avowed ascription of Christ's Merits, have assigned to them by the declared sentence of God, a condition of JUSTIFICATION, and a TITLE to all the blessings that do both in time and in eternity to those Merits attach.

And as the action of God in Judgment was founded *wholly* on the ground of Legal Oneness having been APPOINTED between Adam and those who stand under his headship: so also the action of God in Grace is founded *wholly* on the Legal Oneness appointed between Christ and those who come under His headship.

Digitized by Google

And as one of the immediate penalties attaching to the imputation of the demerit of Adam's transgression is association with him in that corrupt and vitiated condition of being that penally attached to him as the Sinning Man who dishonoured God: so one of the immediate effects resulting from the imputation of the merit of Christ's obedience is association with Him (through the new man created in us, and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost) with that condition of blessedness, holiness, and glory, that pertaineth to Christ as the Obedient One who, in all things, served and glorified God with a perfectness equal to the perfectness of God.

And as personal participation in Adam's corrupt condition of being (reached by birth *as the means*) is *the consequence*, not *the cause* of our Condemnation and Punishment: so personal participation (reached by spiritual birth *as the means*) is *the consequence*, not *the cause*, of our Justification and Blessing. The Representative action of another (in which we have no personal participation) is the ground, and the alone ground, of our being pronounced, when we enter the sphere of natural existence, heirs of wrath. The Representative vicarious action of Another (in which we have no personal participation) is the ground, and the alone ground, of our being pronounced, when we enter the sphere of spiritual being, heirs of everlasting blessing.

Digitized by Google

§ VI.

If these things be so, it must be very evident that the Representative headship of Christ (seeing that it is the first actual bestowment of God's grace on His elect people) is carefully to be distinguished from all other subsequent bestowments, seeing that all such bestowments are *results* dependent on, and exclusively EARNED BY, the service of Christ in His Representative headship.

It must be remembered, however, that two other Headships pertain to Christ, both essentially necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes of God touching His people. Christ has been appointed by God to be "Head over all things," governmentally. "He is Lord of all;" Lord of the universe; all things being subjected to Him. As possessed of this high governmental headship He has also been given to the Church to be ITS Head, "Head" being in this passage used in a sense analogous to that in which we speak of the chief member of our natural body in its relation to its other members. He who is governmentally Head over all things is also in another sense Head of the Church. He has with the Church a living union through the Spirit. Thus

Digitized by Google

each individual member of the family of faith hath given unto him "all spiritual blessing (ευλογια πνευματικη) in heavenly places in Christ." But all this height of blessing, and all the results thereof, is a bestowment of grace grounded entirely on the perfectness of the service which Christ, in virtue of His LEGAL ONENESS with us, rendered in our stead to God. By that service every blessing that we subsequently receive, whether in earth or in heaven, was EARNED.

Therefore, however vast and wonderful the *developments* of God's grace are, we must not allow these resulting developments to be placed in parity with, or in any way to overshadow, the first great act of the divine mercy in appointing the Representative Federal headship of God the Son. Acting in that headship, God the Son, becoming man, brought into the earth fulness of divine strength, and in that strength encountered not only the fury of Satan and of men, but also the unmitigated fierceness of divine wrath in death; bore it with heavenly perfectness, and sustained the governmental holiness of God. Having brought into the earth heavenly and divine perfectness, He manifested it in every relation in which He stood, whether toward God or toward man. He manifested it in life; He manifested it in penal death; and presented it with Himself on the accursed tree (which His oblation turned into an Altar) for an

Digitized by Google

offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour. On this great act, a representative act once and for ever finished on the cross—an act that ever will remain unique in the history of the universe—God has founded all the operations of His grace for ever. His throne of grace rests upon it; that, as sin hath reigned in the power of "death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." In the order of the arrangements of God the blessing founded on the appointment of Christ to the Federal headship of His people, takes precedence of all other blessings that flow from that appointment. It is of infinite importance that in the apprehension of our souls we should recognise the order of the action of God.

We must remember, too, that none of the relations *predestinatively* appointed to those who are chosen in Christ, become actual realised relations until spiritual birth brings us personally into the household of faith. Whenever God in the sovereignty of His grace is pleased to view us through the value of that work which Christ's sacrificial service has supplied, He quickens us, and, bestowing on us the gift of faith, brings us into the confession of the Name of Christ, and thus gives us a title to take our place among the justified. From that moment we are regarded and treated as regenerate. So, receiving life through the quickening power of

Digitized by Google

the Spirit, we become (however weak our faith, or however imperfect our knowledge) *personally* associated with Christ. That which is absolutely the greatest of all God's gifts (for what can be so great as the imputation of the infinite meritoriousness of the sacrificial service of His Son?)—that meritoriousness is in all its fulness placed upon us, and that at a moment when, looked at personally, we are not only unworthy, but loathsome and vile. Was it not so with Paul when he was stricken to the earth, and cried, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Who gave that merciful blow? Who caused Saul to cry? What was his condition when that merciful stroke reached him? Had he not well nigh committed the unpardonable sin? If he had done wittingly what he did ignorantly, he would have committed it. Vile indeed he was when the salvation of God reached him. So, likewise, will it be with the Remnant of Israel when, suddenly visited by mercy from above, they shall look on Him whom they pierced, and, in a moment, be clothed with the garments of salvation. They will not doubt then that God "justifieth the ungodly." If He did not, none would ever be justified at all.

Many struggle against these truths. Some, altogether misunderstanding the nature of Legal Oneness, speak as if the fact of Adam being our progenitor made us personally and actually to transgress:

Digitized by Google

as if there were no contrast between personal and vicarious representative action. Their notions will not for a moment endure the test of Romans v. They are obliged for example to mis-translate ἐφ' ᾧ in verse 12,* and also virtually to cancel the words, "by one offence death reigned BY ONE," verse 17. The Apostle does not say "*by many*."

Not a few teach that predestination to life causes those who are so predestinated, to become and to be treated as actually members of Christ before they are quickened, born, or converted; as if predestination to membership were the same thing as actuality of membership! And hence they dare to speak of "Eternal Justification."

It is obvious that if the elect, before conversion, were in any sense regarded as actually in Christ, they could not, when born into the world, stand (as they certainly do stand) on the same ground as other men. They could not be "children of wrath even as others." All the elect must in that case be born as possessors of living union with Christ. The Gospel could not be preached unto them as persons "dead in trespasses and sins." They could not find their title to look to Christ in the fact of their being lost sinners as other men. All who cherish notions such as these are unconscious of the distinction that

* See observation on this subject on page 12.

Digitized by Google

exists between Legal Oneness and Spiritual Union. The two cannot be blended. We must, in every case of substitutional action, exclude the thought of co-operative, concurrent, and participative action. Combine where God has separated, and we mar God's work. Two links in a chain may be associated; but they are two links, not one; and if we attempt to fuse them into one, we destroy in divine things the work of God.

After we are made by the quickening power of the Spirit living members of the Body of Christ, we become, *in measure*, practically associated with Him in thought, feeling, and action. But in the previous actions of His Representative headship He stands emphatically *alone*, acting not merely FOR us, but acting strictly IN OUR STEAD,* תחת, ὑπερ. With such action we have no participation in any wise. Though He will share with His people His cup of everlasting joy, He drank the penal cup ALONE; He offered the great oblation of Himself ALONE. In that great Act none were with Him. See Leviticus xvi., 17, "And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make

* Few things are more needful than to maintain that the preposition ὑπερ, when used of the sacrificial work of the Lord Jesus Christ, answers strictly to the Hebrew word תחת, as used in Genesis xxii., 13, where Abraham "offered up the ram *in the stead of* his son." ὑπερ means strictly *instead of* in all such connections, and not merely *for*, or *on behalf of*. See Note, page 53.

Digitized by Google

an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel." In His Representative headship He *earned* for His people the bestowment of union with Himself in the Headship of communicated Life; and He earned it by His own act ALONE. We participated not in it.

Digitized by Google

§ VII.

The following statement from the pen of a well-known writer appeared in the Expositor in December 1885. I refer to it with regret; but it is necessary that it should be considered, for the subject is not one of secondary importance.

"Within the organism of His true Church, which is the sphere also of the 'eternal covenant,' there is nothing, no branch, no limb, that has not part in the two distinct but concurrent blessings, the Merit and the Life. Participation in the Life, participation of the kind we have tried in earlier paragraphs to indicate, carries with it at least a profound suggestion *how* the Head can so suffer beneath the stroke of the Law as that the judicial effects shall pass on to the Members. The imputation loses all character of a 'legal fiction,' while yet it remains a fact essentially legal, when the solidarity of the Head and of the Members, their solidarity in a sense not conventional but real, is taken into account. The mystery of the matter doubtless is that the Head and the Members are not personally identical. But this is, to say the least of it, *relieved* by the other mystery, which is a fact of revelation, that the Head and the Members are 'one spirit.'"

I feel it my duty to say that the doctrine taught in this passage must earnestly be resisted. If it be

Digitized by Google

true, all that has been said in the foregoing pages respecting the imputation of Adam's sin and the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and also respecting the distinction between legal oneness with Christ as our federal Representative, and spiritual oneness with Him in heavenly life, must be renounced as false. Happily, in one passage the writer himself seems to shrink from maintaining the truth of his strange hypothesis; for he says, "the mystery of the matter doubtless is, that the Head and the Members are not personally identical." This indeed is true; and it is a truth which, if steadily maintained as it is taught in Scripture, necessarily subverts his theory respecting Imputation and the Atonement.

Nothing can be more absolutely certain than that our Sponsor and Surety, whether viewed as God from everlasting or as God incarnate, held and holds a position that is (both personally and officially) absolutely contrasted not only with that of men as men, but with that of those whose Surety He became. He acted in His own distinct personality when, before all worlds, He undertook to be the Surety of all those given by the Father unto Him. See John xvii. A legal oneness with Himself was predestinatively appointed to all who were so given unto Him. Personally they were "children of wrath, dead in trespasses and sins," having no spiritual

Digitized by Google

union with God or with Christ, but were in the extreme of moral distance from God; nor from that state could they be rescued, or quickened with heavenly life, unless merits—impossible for them to earn—were obtained for them by the vicarious service of Another. God in consistency with the claims of His holiness could neither receive nor pardon, nor quicken nor grant spiritual union with Christ, to any who were not provided through atoning sacrifice with the meritorious ground of acceptance before Him,—to any whom He had not resolved to bring under the value of the atoning work of His Son, and to impute the value of that work to them, so as to view them possessed of its acceptableness. To this end in eternity a legal oneness was established between Christ and all whom He was appointed to "bring as sons unto glory." In order that He might effect this purpose, He came into the world as man; but by His incarnation no union was formed by Him with men as men. His first object in coming was to remove the hindrances that prevented God, as holy, from bestowing life or spiritual union with Himself, on persons who were by nature dead in trespasses and sins. A vast gulf separated the Holy Sponsor from those whom He came to redeem and to sanctify by a sacrificial death—He being the holy and the living One: they being children of wrath, dead toward God, not having the

Digitized by Google

Spirit, but on the contrary having "the mind of the flesh which is enmity against God and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." His words when He came into the world were, "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God." And what was that will? It was, that all His believing people of every age, past, present, or to come, should be sanctified by the offering of His body once. And again we read, "Jesus, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate," Hebrews xiii. In the typical appointments of Leviticus none could be anointed with the holy oil (a type of the Spirit) who were not first hallowed by the blood. Guilt, and the wrath that followed upon guilt, must be removed before the Spirit can be bestowed. But wrath must abide wherever substitutional death has not intervened to remove it. In the Levitical types the sacrifice was presented to God before it was slain, in order that it might be recognised as unblemished. Consequently, nothing could be more marked than the contrast between the substituted victim so presented, and the unclean person or persons in whose stead it was to be slain. Moreover, the Lord Jesus was a Priest as well as a Sacrifice; nor could any atoning sacrifice be offered except by a priest. Accordingly, it is written of the Lord that *He offered up Himself*, Hebrews vii. 27. So He fulfilled the service of Leviticus xvi., which prescribed

Digitized by Google

the manner in which the priesthood of atonement was to be accomplished.

And here I would simply ask this question: The Lord Jesus undoubtedly presented Himself as a Sacrifice and a Priest;—did the fact that His believing people were in Him, cause them in any sense to become in their own persons a sacrifice for sin? Did they bear in their own persons sin's awful curse? Did they offer themselves in their own persons as a sweet smelling savour unto God, or in any way co-operate with the Lord Jesus in so doing? Was this possible? If it had been, vicarious sacrifice would have been impossible; for a work which is partially effected by ourselves could not be performed by a substitute IN OUR STEAD. We must abandon, therefore, the expression *instead of;* we must say that, being IN HIM, we acted WITH HIM, and were in part personal agents in the work of our salvation. Substitution would in that case cease to be.*

In the ordinance appointed in Leviticus xvi. the object was, the removal of defilement from those who needed protection from wrath; and we are typically taught that atoning blood and pure frank-

* The author of the paper in the Expositor, from which the foregoing extract is taken, has said much upon what he terms "the IN-ness and the FOR-ness of Christ" for His people. It might have been well if he had also made some remarks upon the expression INSTEAD-OF-ness. But his system affords no place for that all-important thought as presented in Scripture.

Digitized by Google

incense, presented by a priest whose purity was equal to the purity of God, were required for expiation. And there could be no question of blessing or of fellowship unless such expiation were supplied. Accordingly, the high priest stood on that day and in that service, emphatically alone. "And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place," Leviticus xvi. 17. God stood in the separateness of His own consuming holiness and glory. The priest stood isolated and alone in the separateness of his own typically untainted priesthood. They for whom he acted, stood in the distance of their own uncleanness and sin, until the expiation should be accomplished.

Yet because the contrast between the Lord Jesus and those in whose stead He acted, is thus emphatically marked in His service on the day of Atonement, we must not suppose that, on other occasions of His priestly ministrations and other services where He acted on behalf of and instead of His people, this contrast between His own personal condition and theirs, is not in its fullest sense recognised. Although now avowedly associated with His people, He is (and ever will be) possessed of a separate sphere of thought and action altogether distinct from, and contrasted with, theirs. The perfectness of His own personal standing is not

Digitized by Google

destroyed by the closeness of association into which His saints are brought with Himself through the Spirit. Independence of action in multitudes of forms will always characterise our great covenant Head in His relation to the redeemed. Perpetual blessing they will be constantly receiving because of that which He is to them. And for such blessings they will not only thank and praise, but worship Him saying, that of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things. All the blessings for which they so worship Him are blessings, in procuring which or administering which, they will thoroughly recognise that there is on their part no concurrency of action or co-operation whatever. Therefore the fact of being united with Him who is alike the meritorious Earner and the Preserver and the Administrator of all covenanted mercies, does not identify us in action with Him from whom such agency proceeds. As no one but Himself could effect atonement, so no one but Himself could meetly present it to God, and duly apply its results to God's people. To atone and to plead, equally require divine power, knowledge, and wisdom. A perfect knowledge both of sin and of holiness, such as God only hath, is needful in dealing with sin in its relation to God in every variety of aspect, not only in expiating but in applying the results of the expiation, whether in intercession or otherwise.

Digitized by Google

The truth thus typically taught in Leviticus was no other than that taught by the Lord Jesus Himself in John xii., at the moment when He was about formally to assume the place of Sacrifice and of Priest before God. "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? [Shall I say] Father save me from this hour? [No,] for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven saying, I have both glorified it and will glorify it again." Here was the solemn recognition by the Father, of Him who had ever been the one solitary Perfect One in the midst of the world's abominations. His feet had ever been "like unto fine brass as if they burned in a furnace;" and such feet must be not only impervious to, but repellent of, all defilement. This was a necessary and inseparable characteristic of one who was God manifest in the flesh, and whose humanity had therefore the same untaintableness as attached to His Godhead.

It was not on the Cross that the Lord Jesus Christ first assumed the responsibility of His people's sins. We are expressly told that He bare them "in His own body TO THE TREE." Such is the right translation of 1 Peter ii. 24. [Επι followed by the accusative cannot be translated as if it were followed by the genitive.] If He had not held a substitutional place, both of service and of suffering, in

Digitized by Google

life, He never would have received at the hands of John "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;" for personal sins He had none; nor would He have sweated great drops of blood in Gethsemane. Throughout life He was the Sin-bearer and Law-fulfiller of His people, though the fulness of the penal cup of suffering was not drunk by Him until He bowed His head under the unmitigated wrath that He bore in death. If it had been possible for us, either in life or in death, to have been partakers in His sacrificial sufferings, we should have tainted those sufferings, and there could have been no atonement; for all atoning victims were required to be, from the beginning to the end of their course, absolutely immaculate. As immaculate they were presented to God; as immaculate they were slain; and and as immaculate, their bodies, or parts thereof, were burned for a sweet savour on the altar. The notion that any accepted sacrifice could be tainted by the sins or punishments which were vicariously borne, is a notion absolutely foreign to everything that is taught respecting atonement throughout the Scripture. It is a notion that would render vicarious atonement impossible, and is, in fact, a deadly heresy. Here, therefore, I again repeat that the words spoken by the Father in John xii. 28, in attestation of the perfectness of the untainted service of the Lord Jesus during His tribulated life, were

Digitized by Google

followed by the declaration of the Lord Jesus as to the step He was about to take in passing into that judicial death in which He was to bear for a season the damnatory wrath of the living God. Standing as the High Priest in pure white linen garments, and also standing as the unblemished Victim, He entered as the untainted Holy One into that unequalled hour of darkness and of wrath in which, as one stricken because of others' sin, He yet was as untainted as when He dwelt in the bosom of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God. And thus in His holy and untainted manhood He presented Himself unto the Father in the perfectness of heavenly fragrance, such as was indicated by that holy perfume treasured in the sanctuary, which God had appointed as its type. It was singular, isolated; none was to be made like thereunto. "And as for the perfume which thou shalt make, ye shall not make to yourselves according to the composition thereof; it shall be unto thee holy for the Lord. Whosoever shall make like unto that, to smell thereto, shall even be cut off from his people," Exodus xxx., 37.

His suffering was strictly in our stead. The offering of His personal holiness, as the antitypical incense that filled the sanctuary with fragrance, was strictly in our stead. His people, redeemed and hallowed thereby, had no part in it whatsoever.

Digitized by Google

They were not the incense. They stood in the distance of sin, as being atoned for. He stood in the nearness of divine and heavenly holiness, as atoning. Destroy that distinction, by saying that the redeemed lived and acted in and with Him through the Spirit, and so measurably shared in His penal sufferings, and also shared in the sweet savour of the oblation of His perfectness, in virtue of their spiritual union with Him, or say that, while suffering under the fulness of divine wrath, He became vicariously TAINTED (as some do say)—and you nullify and destroy the substitution of the Cross. Christianity, as taught in Holy Scripture, is nullified.

Mark well the words of the Lord Jesus when He said, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it ABIDETH ALONE; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." These words sufficiently prove that the bestowment of the Spirit on the redeemed is a consequence, not a precursor, of the atoning death. The same truth is taught by the Apostle when he says, that the Father "reconciled us in the body of Christ's flesh through death, to present us holy and without blemish and uncharged in His sight,"—*αμωμους και ανεγκλητους*. Until we are regarded in the courts of God as "uncharged" with guilt, we cannot have *living union* with Christ through the Spirit; although we have *legal oneness* with Him as a Surety, granted to us by the appoint-

Digitized by Google

ment of God's elective grace given to us in Christ Jesus before the world was.

I do not know that I have ever read from the pen of any one who has not abandoned the doctrine of Justification by Faith, words more to be lamented than the statements quoted by me from the Expositor, on which I have commented. The passage teaches us that the stroke that falls on the atoning Head passes on to His members as one with Him through the Spirit, and that thus the doctrine of "the imputation loses all character of being 'a legal fiction.'" I will not say the writer actually adopts these awful words, for he marks them with inverted commas; but he certainly palliates them, and implies that the doctrine of the absolute substitution and separate standing of our great Surety is more or less open to the charge of being a legal fiction. What is there of fiction, or the appearance of fiction, in the fact that my heavenly Surety did (apart from me and whilst I was dead in trespasses and sins, and was so regarded by God) bear the curse due to my sins in His own person alone in my stead; and in my stead He did at the same moment also present, in a perfect manner, as God's High Priest, His own perfect meritoriousness unto God; and that God (as soon as He was pleased, in His electing grace, to view me under the shelter of my Surety's work, and to "call" me to personal faith

Digitized by Google

therein) did impute to me all the meritoriousness of that work, and, as a consequence, grant to me living union with my Surety, not as a pre-requisite, much less as a procuring cause, of that imputation, but as a consequence thereof? To teach what the passage cited above teaches is indeed to preach "a DIFFERENT gospel which IS NOT ANOTHER" (*ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὁ οὐκ ἐστιν ἄλλο*). It virtually nullifies imputation, and nullifies substitution.

I scarcely need say that the isolated character of the atoning work of our Surety was in no way affected by the fact that its accomplishment was anticipatively acted on. The fact that the Old Testament saints had been quickened by the Spirit before they were actually redeemed, did not cause any difference to exist between the mode of their redemption and that of ours. The fact of their being quickened did not cause them personally to share in the sacrificial service or suffering of their Substitute. Christ was the Lamb foreordained, and the value of His atoning work was anticipatively acted on. In consequence of such anticipation Moses and Elijah were allowed to stand by Him in glory; and on the same ground the disciples were allowed to receive the symbols of His broken body and shed blood, before the sacrifice to which those symbols referred was accomplished. There are not two modes of redemption. The Old Testament saints

Digitized by Google

and ourselves have been redeemed in the same manner, and at the same hour. Moses and Elijah, when they stood on the Mount of Transfiguration by the side of their Lord, and spake with Him concerning His decease which He was to accomplish at Jerusalem, full well understood that He, their Lord and their God, was about *in their stead* to enter into a sphere of action and of suffering in which none could share with Him, and in which no mere creature could stand.

> The mighty work was all His own,
> And He shall ever wear the crown.

No one could stand in closer relation to his God and Saviour than John in Patmos. He was truly in Him: and "he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit." Yet when taken, while still in the flesh, into the presence of Christ in glory, John had no ability to act with Christ within the sphere of that glory. On the contrary, he fell at His feet as dead. Did John, or any other of Christ's servants, ever act with their Lord in that sphere of His Almighty being in which He upholdeth, and ever has upheld, everything in the created universe by the word of His power? Much less could we share with Him the experiences of that great hour of unutterable darkness during which He met an intensity of veritable wrath such as none but God could originate, and none but God could bear. When God said, "Awake,

Digitized by Google

O Sword, against my Fellow," the stroke was borne by Jehovah's Fellow, and by Him ALONE.

I by no means assert that the writer of these extracts, or others who may sanction them, are disposed to accept all the conclusions to which they necessarily *lead.* It is evident, however, that all who favour them must fail to adequately distinguish between living union with Christ in the Spirit, and legal oneness with Him as the federal Head of the redeemed,—a distinction of vital moment, and an essential to a right division of the word of Truth. Nor can they have apprehended the distinction between the Originating Sin of Adam, and Original Sinfulness, or corruption, which is the consequence of that Originating sin. Nor can they have apprehended the distinction between the Originating Righteousness of our God and Saviour presented in our stead unto the Father, and the result and consequence of that presentation as earning for us living union with Himself in the Spirit. It is very evident that no one who recognised these distinctions could have written the Article we are now considering.

Ulterior consequences, however, may (and in some cases have) followed the adoption of these principles. Many years ago the painful duty devolved on me of excluding from communion at the Lord's Table a person of great intelligence, great philanthropy, and extensive influence. The ground of exclusion was

Digitized by Google

the statement that we are not saved by Substitution, but by being spiritually united to Christ as members of His body, and so partaking in the suffering and service of our Head. Mystics are always in danger of this heresy, and its introduction in the early ages of the post-Apostolic church contributed in no small degree, in Patristic and Mediæval ages, to the undermining of the true doctrine of Substitution as taught in Scripture.

Because the Lord Jesus sympathises with, and identifies Himself with, the sorrows and sufferings of His servants while struggling for God's Truth in the earth (very markedly He did this when He said to Saul the persecutor, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou ME?"), it does not follow on this account that we are able to place ourselves by His side in those high and isolated services and sufferings whereby, by His own unaided strength, He earned for us the title both to serve and to suffer. In many of the Psalms, especially those which describe the coming conflicts with Antichrist and Antichristian lawlessness in the latter day, we find examples of the manner in which the Lord Jesus associates Himself with His suffering servants in their conflicts and trials. But there are other Psalms and passages in which such association is impossible. See for example, the twenty-second Psalm. "I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax; it is

Digitized by Google

melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death. For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet. I may tell all my bones: they look and stare upon me. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture. But be not thou far from me, O Lord; O my strength, haste thee to help me. Deliver my soul from the sword; my darling from the power of the dog. Save me from the lion's mouth, and from the horns of the buffaloes. Thou hast heard me; I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the congregation will I praise Thee."

In passages like these—and there are many such, both in the Psalms and in the Prophets—we see Christ, in His own personal isolation, standing in that distinctive solitariness of substitutional service and of suffering that enabled Him to become God our Redeemer.

If my already prolonged life should be further extended, I hope to return to the consideration of some of the subjects referred to in the preceding pages. At present I will only observe that the blessed doctrine of God's electing grace, if received as taught in Scripture, does not in any wise obstruct or hinder the full proclamation of God's grace as

Digitized by Google

revealed in that Gospel which He has commanded to be preached to every creature. The serpent of brass was presented to every dying Israelite, and all were commanded to look. So every dying sinner is commanded to look to the great Anti-type, and thus finds his title to look in the fact that he is perishing. The Apostle said to a mingled multitude, many of whom spurned the message, "Men and brethren, through this man, Jesus, is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him, all that believe are justified from all things," see Acts xiii. 38. I was once told by a Christian minister who wished to limit the grace of God, that he knew those words were in the Scripture, but that he could not receive them. It is a fearful thing, in any way, or on any subject, to reply against God. A right-minded child receives what his teacher has taught him, simply because he believes in his teacher's truthfulness. I have already quoted the words which well nigh conclude the written record of God's grace. "The Spirit and the bride say Come; and let him that heareth say Come; and whosoever desireth [ὁ θελων] let him come and take the water of life freely." May all who read these words say earnestly, AMEN.

Digitized by Google

Note.

"Thus, whilst both *αντι* and *ὑπερ*, when applied to the sacrificial work of our Lord, equally denote substitution, the distinction is, that *ὑπερ* peculiarly directs our minds to our Substitute as *screening* us by undertaking our responsibilities, and submitting to the penalties due to us; whereas *αντι* directs to the same Substitute viewed as rendering for us *compensation* to God. The predominating (though not exclusive) thought in *ὑπερ* is the benefit to us: the predominating thought in *αντι* is the recognition of the claim of God, met by adequate substitutional compensation. It must, however, be carefully remembered that distinctions like these imply, not absolute contrast, but only predominating aspect. In 1 Tim. ii. 6, *ὁ δους ἑαυτον αντιλυτρον ὑπερ παντων*,—who gave Himself a ransom for all classes of His believing people—the idea of substitution is equally expressed by *αντι* and by *ὑπερ*: but the first directs our minds to the compensatory value of the ransom, the latter, to its presentation on our behalf, and for our benefit; but in either case, the redeeming price is regarded as something supplied by Another in our

Digitized by Google

stead. Indeed, there is no passage in the New Testament, in which ὑπερ is used in relation to the work of the Lord Jesus for us, in which its strict substitutional force is not maintained." From "Thoughts on Scriptural Subjects," page 375.

"'Υπερ when used in reference to the sacrificial relation of Christ to His people, involves the full notion of deliverance by substitution. A bird might die over its offspring, and yet those offspring perish; a friend might fall in shielding another, and yet that other be himself destroyed; but this could never happen where such a death took place under a law which had stipulated (and had power to carry out the stipulation) that he, on behalf of whom another paid the penalty of death, should be legally regarded as if he himself had died, and should so become free from all penalty.

"Accordingly we find the following most important statement in 2 Cor. v. The Apostle, in speaking of the relation of Christ's death to believers, says "If one person died ὑπερ all (that is, all believers) then the whole died—*ει εἷς ὑπερ παντων απεθανεν, αρα οἱ παντες απεθανον.* This is established as a universal principle of the divine government. This text declares that when one person has died ὑπερ a certain company, the order of the divine government is to consider such company as having judicially died. No one therefore can question that ὑπερ in this pas-

Digitized by Google

sage is equivalent to *instead of*." From "Notes Expository of the Greek of the First Chapter of the Romans," pages 43 to 50, where see further remarks upon the prepositions ὑπερ, περι and αντι.

A very valuable Note on the meaning of ὑπερ will be found in the Appendix of a work entitled, "The Doctrine of Holy Scripture respecting the Atonement," by T. J. Crawford, D.D. It shows how often ὑπερ is used in the sense of *instead of* by the best classical writers, especially in connection with vicarious death.

Some remarks also on that most important text, "He brought our sins in his own body to the tree," 1 Peter ii. 24, will be found in the work entitled, "Christ our Suffering Surety," also advertised at the end of this pamphlet.

Digitized by Google

WORKS

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,
12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, LONDON, E.C. 1.

AIDS TO PROPHETIC ENQUIRY. First Series. Third Edition. Price 6s.

PROSPECTS OF THE TEN KINGDOMS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE CONSIDERED. Second Edition, revised. Price 7s

BABYLON AND EGYPT. Price 6s.

THOUGHTS ON THE APOCALYPSE. Second Edition, revised. Price 8s. 6d.

NOTES EXPOSITORY OF THE GREEK OF ROMANS I. Price 2s. 6d.

THOUGHTS ON PARTS OF THE PROPHECY OF ISAIAH. Second Edition. Price 4s. 6d.

THOUGHTS ON SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS. Price 4s. 6d.

THE PROPHECY OF THE LORD JESUS AS CONTAINED IN MATTHEW XXIV. AND XXV. Third Edition. Price 1s. 3d.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS.—No. I. Price 2s.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS.—No. II. Price 2s. 6d.

THOUGHTS ON LEVITICUS. Second Edition. Price 3s. 6d.

GOSPEL TRUTHS. Third Edition. Price 1s.

EUROPE AND THE EAST. Second Edition, enlarged. Price 2s.

DAVID, KING OF ISRAEL. Second Edition. Price 2s. 6d.

THE JUDGMENTS ON THE "ESSAYS AND REVIEWS" CONSIDERED. Price, cloth, 2s.; wrapper, 1s. 6d.

ROMANS VII. CONSIDERED. Second Edition. Price 1s.

MODERN DOCTRINES RESPECTING SINLESSNESS CONSIDERED. Price 6d.

SALVATION BY SUBSTITUTION. Price 6d.

FIVE LETTERS ON EVENTS PREDICTED IN SCRIPTURE AS ANTECEDENT TO THE COMING OF THE LORD. Second Edition. Price 1s.

ORDER OF EVENTS CONNECTED WITH THE APPEARING OF CHRIST. Second Edition. Price 6d.

THE WORLD TO COME. Fifth Edition. Price 2d.

WHAT IS THE EPHAH OF ZECHARIAH V.? Price 3d.

CONVERSATION ON REVELATION XVII. Price 2d.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF OF THE FIRST RESURRECTION. Second Edition. Price 4d.

Digitized by Google

No. III.]

TRACTS ON DOCTRINAL SUBJECTS.

Erroneous Statements

CONCERNING

Atonement and its Results

CONSIDERED.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

LONDON:

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,
12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, LONDON, E.C. 1.

1877.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Erroneous Statements Concerning Atonement and its Results Considered.

FIFTY years ago, few who professed adherence to the Gospel of the grace of God, would have taken exception to the doctrines respecting Atonement, which have been advanced in the preceding tracts. But it is otherwise now. There has of late years been, in various ways, a wide departure from the doctrines of Scripture. Many refuse to admit that Atonement was required to "*appease*" the wrath of God against sin. They object to the use of the word "appeasement," and deem it an error to speak of God demanding "satisfaction." Some affirm that Atonement was effected by the suffering of penal inflictions *merely;* others assert that *penal* inflictions were not borne at all, but that there was the offering of a sweet-smelling savour only. A pamphlet lies now before me elaborately maintaining this. Many are adopting the semi-Socinian statement,

Digitized by Google

that Atonement was not *finished* on the Cross, and speak of its being effected by offering made in heaven. Others say that substitution is no essential part of Atonement, and speak as if Christ had effected for all men "the putting away" (αθετησις) of sin. The fact is that the habit of "lawlessness," which the Scripture marks as the great characteristic of the latter days, has penetrated even into the Church of God. Men think apart from Scripture; they are impatient of its restraints. Familiarity with German writings has shaken the faith, and tainted the minds of many in this country. In the early days of the Socinian heresy, many, who thoroughly repudiated its more advanced statements, were, through want of steady adherence to the Scripture, perplexed, and made undue concessions. Outram was an example of this. So likewise now. Many who abhor the doctrines of advanced Neology, have been perplexed by some of the statements of writers virtually neologian, and have been lured away from close obedience to the Word of God.

The controversy that was awakened two years ago in this country, respecting the nature and consequences of "indwelling sin," afforded painful evidence of the degree in which Scripture was departed from as the alone rule of faith. Erroneous views of the nature, extent and consequences of the Atonement, were sorrowfully manifested during that controversy. After the course of meetings, held at Oxford, Brighton and elsewhere, had terminated, a large and influential Con-

Digitized by Google

ference, which has for many years past been held annually in London, assembled. It had no sympathy whatever with the doctrines that had been maintained in the meetings to which I have just referred. It might have been expected, therefore, that all the speakers in this last meeting would have well weighed their words, and have been careful to use "sound speech that could not be condemned." But it was far otherwise. Not that there was any deliberate design to subvert the truth; but inadvertence and want of due reflection, there certainly was; and an inadvertent, unintended undermining of the Truth by the Truth's friends, is often more disastrous in its results than open and undisguised assault.

In one of the papers prepared for, and read at the meeting, we find the following passage:—(I quote from the published report in one of the leading evangelical journals):—*

"When it [the blood of Christ] is sprinkled on our souls, it imparts to us, not merely or mainly the death which was endured for sin, but the life of Christ in its cleansing, hallowing, purifying power. That life which bore in death the curse and penalty of sin, survives in perfect purity, and we become partakers of it by the sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus; so that the soul is purged from defilement by having His life diffused all over it, and all through it.

On this passage I hope, subsequently, to remark at length. At present I would only say that the Scrip-

* January 21st, 1876.

Digitized by Google

ture nowhere speaks of the soul becoming "purged of defilement" by having "*the life* of Jesus" diffused over it: nor does it ever teach that the life of Jesus is "diffused *all over it and through it.*" It would be difficult, I think, to find, in the records of Mysticism or Perfectionism, any statement more objectionable than this. It is true, indeed, that one voice, but (so far as appears from the published account of the meeting) one voice only was raised against this statement. The remonstrance was met by the author of the paper replying, "that his remarks on the point referred to were based on Fairbairn's book on the "Typology of Scripture," adding that blood sprinkling was represented in types as a cleansing and hallowing, *and as the application of life to the soul.**

To this subject, which is one of the deepest moment, I hope to return. There are, however, certain other connected statements first to be considered—statements important in themselves, but important also as indicating the steps by which the conclusions to which I have just referred have been reached.

It was stated in the same paper (Fairbairn being still rested on as the authority) that our sin, by imputation, became so connected with "the blood or life" of our Substitute, that His blood or life was regarded by God as an "unclean and accursed thing" until it had been poured out in death.

* The italics are mine.

Digitized by Google

I quote the words as reported :—

"The blood was therefore the life, after death had taken place. But it was no longer guilty by imputation ; *it was no longer an unclean or accursed thing.* On the contrary, it had now a hallowing influence on all that it touched."*

Now, it is utterly untrue to say that our sin, by imputation, or in any other way, became so connected with our Substitute, or with His life or blood, as for that blood or life to be, or to be esteemed to be "an unclean and accursed thing. It was not the blood of "guilty or condemned life." It was the life-blood of the Holy one of God which was capable of being presented, and was presented on the Cross, both *before* His death and *at* His death, in recognised acceptableness unto God. The imputation of His people's guilt did not cause personal defilement or taint in any sense whatever to attach to the person of their Substitute. *Imputation* is not *impartation.* In accepted substitution it is necessary that the Substitute should retain His personal qualities throughout; and be unpenetrated by, and be regarded as unpenetrated by, any defiling

* The italics are mine. That this statement was made inadvertently and without due reflection, I believe. I think the same of many of the statements of Dr. Fairbairn, to which I shall subsequently refer, and who uses the word "polluted." Nevertheless, errors inadvertently adopted are not the less dangerous on that account, especially when they fall in with a prevailing current of thought which, originating in Germanism and Socinianism, is setting in with great force in this country.

Digitized by Google

influence throughout the whole period of His substitution. In speaking of our sin being imputed to our Substitute, we do not mean that our sin was so infused into Him, or in any way so connected with Him as for His personal perfectness in body or in soul to be in one jot or tittle affected. We mean only that our sin was in such sense charged to His account as for the punishableness thereof to be incurred by Him whilst He Himself (that word "*Himself*" including "His blood or life") was throughout recognised by God as pure, holy, and worthy of all blessing. "*Personal moral qualities and the pollution inherent in sinful ones are inalienable, and cannot be transferred by imputation.*"* Christ was not "made sin" in the sense of being changed into sin, or as having sin *infused into* or *imparted* to Him in any way. God "made Him to be sin for us" not by impartation, but by the imputation of that which avowedly was not His personally—which is the only way in which a holy *Substitute* (who must be recognised as personally holy during the whole period of His substitution) could become connected with sin. Nor is it true that Christ assumed a forfeited or unclean life. If so, He could not have said, "No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself:" nor could He have said, "Thinkest thou not that I could even now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." The life He laid down, that very life He took again;

* Hodge on Atonement.

Digitized by Google

and it was in no respect more pure and holy when He laid it down than when He took it again. He who had not a forfeited or unclean life, took upon Himself the responsibilities and punishableness of those who had a forfeited and unclean life, that by voluntarily laying down under wrath a *pure* life, He might not only remove those responsibilities, but earn for those for whom He died, an acceptableness commensurate with the acceptableness of the offering of "*sweet savour*" that He presented *on the Cross*, and apart from which "sweet savour," there could have been no atonement.

For we must avoid the dangerous and indeed heretical doctrine (now unhappily so prevalent) that atonement was effected by suffering *merely*. The Cross is now often spoken of as if it were the place of judgment, wrath, and death *only*. Nothing can be more untrue. It is indeed true that on the Cross Christ was "made a curse for us;" that is to say, whilst personally regarded by God as One who deserved not wrath, but blessing—infinitude of blessing, he nevertheless received in His pure and holy Person, the wrath appointed to Him before the world was, as His people's Substitute; under which wrath He poured forth His holy blood. "It pleased Jehovah to bruise him, and to put him to grief." He who undertook to be the Substitute of persons who had not only transgressions, but who had a nature radically sinful—flesh in which no good thing dwelt—He who undertook to be a Sub-

Digitized by Google

stitute for such, must necessarily be under responsibilities from which He could be discharged only by meeting veritable wrath; and such wrath Jesus met. Most truly therefore the Cross was the place of judgment and judicial death. But it was not only this. It was also the place where He, who never ceased to be the Light and the Life—the Son of the Father's bosom, His elect in whom His soul delighted, "gave Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour." The word "Himself" (as I have already said) necessarily includes His life and blood; consequently His blood was a constituent part of "the offering of sweet-smelling savour." But it would have been impossible that it could have been this if it had been regarded as "unclean or accursed." It was never so regarded. On the contrary, it was always recognised as pure and holy. The burnt-offering which was avowedly an offering of "sweet savour," was as needful to atonement as the sin-offering. (See Lev. i. 4, and also the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement in Lev. xvi.) "Even the sin-offering was not duly offered until the fat thereof had been burned for fragrance" (קְטֹרֶת) on the altar. (See Lev. xvi. 25.) Moreover, the blood is specifically mentioned as "scattered," and *offered on the altar for atonement.* "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you *upon the altar* to make an atonement for the soul," or (as many more correctly translate) "to make an atonement *by the life,*" that is,

Digitized by Google

by the life *laid down*—an alteration which instead of weakening, strengthens the arguments already used, for it proves not only that the atonement was accomplished by laying down the life, and was therefore finished at the Cross, but it proves also that the life there laid down was regarded as pure and holy *before* it was laid down, otherwise it could not have been presented *on the altar*.* The offering of the incense, and of the

---

* See also Leviticus i. 5, "And the priests, Aaron's sons, shall offer the blood and scatter the blood round about upon the altar," etc. "Offer" קָרַב (which is here mis-rendered by our translators as if it were הֵבִיא "*bring*") means, throughout Leviticus, *to bring near and present as an offering*. It involves the thought of solemn presentation, and is especially used of such offerings as were presented with a view to *acceptableness* being acknowledged. It has not therefore the mere general sense of הֵבִיא, *bring*.

The blood of atonement may be viewed as shed under the stroke of righteous judgment, as when the blood of the Sin-offering was poured at the bottom of the altar as the memorial of judgment inflicted; or it may be regarded in its own intrinsic preciousness as something acceptable to Him to whom it is offered and therefore scattered *on* the "altar." The blood was first "*brought nigh as an offering*," and then scattered *on* the altar as something precious and acceptable to God.

I say "scattered," because it was not partially "sprinkled" with the finger. Sprinkle, נזה, must carefully be distinguished from "scatter" זרק. The latter is used when the blood is used or "scattered" in large quantity, and is used in the case of offerings of sweet savour, or when that which is presented or offered for acceptance, as in the case before us. The former נזה to sprinkle, *stillation*, i.e., in drops, when the removal of defilement was the object. But whether the blood of the

Digitized by Google

burnt-offering for a sweet savour, and the burning of the fat of the sin-offering for fragrance (הַקְטָר) on the altar, was as needful to the effectuation of atonement as was "the burning up" (שְׂרֵפָה) the sin-offering without the camp. In other words, the presentation of the required perfectness, and the bearing of the appointed wrath, were *both* needful to atonement, and both were accomplished on the Cross. The blood was not "sprinkled" on anything before its holiness and purity had been recognised by presentation on the altar and by acceptance *there*. Shall we deny this? Shall we say that the anti-typical burnt-offering was offered in heaven, and that its blood was "scattered upon" an altar there? We must either assert this, or allow that atonement was *finished at the Cross*, and that acceptance for all believers was thereby finally attained.

As soon as our holy Substitute bowed His head on the Cross and said, "It is finished: and gave up

---

victim be "poured out," "scattered," or "sprinkled," it was in all cases regarded as pure and holy. Some have imagined that the thought of expiation or atonement is to be connected with the *sin-offering* only, and not with the burnt-offering; but this is a great mistake. On the Day of Atonement the burnt-offering was as much required as the sin-offering [See Lev. xvi.]; and in Lev. i., where the appointments respecting the burnt-offering are prescribed, we find these words: "He [the offerer] shall offer it for his acceptance (לְרָצֹנוֹ) at the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation, . . . and it shall be accepted for him to *make an atonement for him*." See "*Thoughts on parts of Leviticus*," [page 41 and 42], as advertised at end.

Digitized by Google

the ghost," every typical offering appointed in Leviticus for *the putting away* (*αθετησις*) of sin received its anti-typical accomplishment as respected all who were reached thereby, that is, the family of faith. The words of the Apostle are express: "But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. ix. 26. The sacrificing of Himself was a priestly act of the Lord Jesus, performed on behalf of His believing people; and as soon as that act was accomplished they were atoned for, and reconciled unto God for ever. From that moment the whole family of faith not only received the final purgation of their sins (*καθαρισμον ἁμαρτιων*, Heb. i. 3), but they were sanctified also—"sanctified *by the offering of the body of Jesus* once." "Jesus, that he might sanctify the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate." Both these texts point to the Cross, and *to that alone*, As soon as God accepted the oblation offered on the Cross (and He accepted it as soon as it was made) His avowed relation to all His believing people was (to use typical language) from a *sprinkled* mercy-seat. Christ on the Cross offered the oblation of Himself in order that that relation might be assumed by the Father; and as soon as the oblation was finished, that relation was assumed, and assumed for ever. At that momeut God avowedly regarded all His believing people as standing under the full value of the oblation that had thus been made, and there-

Digitized by Google

fore (to use typical language) He recognised them as "*sprinkled.*" The completion, therefore, of the oblation, the acceptance thereof, the sprinkling of the mercy-seat, and the recognition of the people as *sprinkled* were associated acts. As soon as the oblation on the Cross was completed, the whole existing family of faith were regarded in the courts of Heaven, as "sprinkled" (ῥεραντισμενοι), "washed" (λελουμενοι) "cleansed" or "purified" (κεκαθαρισμενοι), and "sanctified" (ἡγιασμενοι); for the acceptance of the atoning oblation by God involved the immediate imputation of its full value to the whole family of faith. They were all (to use typical language) "sprinkled," because the value of the atoning blood was ascribed to them by God. If they had not been "sprinkled," that is, brought under the ascribed value of the blood, their sins would not have been put away. In other words, they would not have been atoned for; for he for whom atonement has been made and accepted, is necessarily "sprinkled." The oblation of the blood on the Cross, its acceptance by God, and application by God to His believing people, were different uses of the blood; but, in whichever of these aspects it be regarded, it was the same holy blood unchanged in its character. It was not either *before* death, or *in* death regarded as an "unclean and accursed" thing, incapable of being sprinkled because of being regarded as unclean. On the contrary, it was regarded as pure and holy, and as a

Digitized by Google

constituent part of the offering of sweet-smelling savour; apart from which no atonement could be made. Moreover, whether we view the blood as offered, or as accepted, or as applied, it is in either case the blood *of death.* It is *life poured out.* "He poured out His soul, or life (נֶפֶשׁ, ψυχη) unto death. The blood wherewith we are sprinkled is the blood whereby atonement was made. It is the blood, not of life in exercise, but *of life resigned*—the blood *of death.* It was blood ever holy, and regarded as holy whilst being shed,—capable, therefore of being presented atoningly unto God, and so bringing "cleansement" and "hallowment" (καθαρισμον και ἁγιασμον) to all those whom God placed under it. They who are sprinkled are "justified," "reconciled," and "sanctified," not by having Christ's blood as "*life* diffused all over and all through" the soul (that is the doctrine of this misleading and dangerous system) * we are justified, reconciled, cleansed and

* Fairbairn asserts that the words of Peter, "Elect unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," refer "to a participation of His divine heavenly life." If results flowing from the *life* of the Lord Jesus in glory be confounded with results flowing from His sacrificial *death*, to which death, and to which alone "the sprinkling of the blood" refers, there is an end to all hope of attaining to the knowledge of redemption as revealed in Scripture. The extract which I shall make from "Fairbairn's Typology," in another tract, will show how distinctly he teaches that the substituted Victim was, *until death had taken place*, regarded as so "polluted" by imputation, as to be incapable of being a sacrifice of sweet savour.

Digitized by Google

sanctified by the blood offered on the Cross and shed on the Cross *in death.* The Father reconciled you *in the body of His* [Christ's] *flesh through death.* And with what result? "To present you holy, without blemish, and uncharged in His sight." Such is the blessing of all those who are atoned for by Christ's sacrificial *death.* All such being regarded by God as standing under the ascribed value of that atoning blood, and therefore "sprinkled," are "presented, holy, without blemish and uncharged." It is not that there is no guilt, no blemishes; but their guilt and blemishes are covered. "Blessed is he whose iniquity is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works." The atoning blood —the blood shed *in death,* is the ground of our reconciliation, of our justification, and of our hallowment,* not by being "diffused all over and all through" our souls *as life,* but in virtue of its having been

* I use the word "hallowment" (ἁγιασμος) in order that sanctification by the blood of the Cross, which is referred to in 1. Cor. i. 30, Heb. x. 10, and Heb. xiii. 12, might be distinguished from that other "sanctification," which is the result of the action of the Holy Ghost who communicates to us *life*, not by imparting to us or diffusing over our souls, *the blood* of Jesus, but by creating in us "the new man," and so bringing us into spiritual union with Jesus, and sustaining in us the new life so communicated. *The blood* of Jesus is not that *life* which is communicated to us by the quickening power of the Spirit of God.

Digitized by Google

presented unto God to free us, by the death of a Substitute whose blood was holy, from the imputation of everything that makes us unfit to be received into the Holiest of all, and to bring to us the imputation of merits that give us a title to stand in the presence of God according to the acceptableness of Him who offered for us. Justification, be it remembered, is not merely pardon. It is the result not only of penalties borne, but also of perfectness presented. Pardon is granted to none to whom righteousness derived from the obedience of an accepted Substitute is not imputed.

In order that we might be able to appear "with faces not ashamed," both in the courts of God's judgment and in the Temple-courts of His worship also, we are placed under the ascribed value of that righteousness and that holiness which was sacrificially presented for us by "The Righteous One," and by "The Holy One" on the Cross. Our title thus to appear, and our title to all the conferred and communicated blessing (whatsoever its character) which is the common heritage of the redeemed, is founded on the work of atonement finished on the Cross.

It is very evident, therefore, that the true doctrine of Atonement as taught in Scripture, must be renounced if this other system be received. The great rule so clearly laid down by orthodox writers, that personal moral qualities, and the pollution inherent in sinful ones, are inalienable and cannot be transferred by

Digitized by Google

imputation is (unconsciously perhaps, but necessarily) repudiated; for it is distinctly taught by this system that the pollution of our sin was so transferred to our Substitute by imputation, that it rendered His life or blood "unclean" and "accursed." Hence it was impossible that He could bring to the Cross the offering of a sweet-smelling savour (Eph. v. 2), or that He could "offer Himself without blemish (αμωμος) to God" (Heb. ix. 14), for He could not offer Himself as unblemished if His life or blood was regarded as "unclean and accursed." Nor, moreover, could He have acted as a Priest in offering Himself, for one that was regarded as unclean could not act as a Priest, and unless He had been able there to present an "unblemished" offering, and an "offering of a sweet-smelling savour," there could have been no atonement, and therefore no reconciliation — no justification. A Substitute who was in any respect regarded as unclean or polluted, could not be accepted as a Substitute: so there could be no salvation.

I trust that the observations I have felt it my duty to make on this subject will give pain to no one; and that they will be regarded not as the accusations of an enemy, but as the admonitions of a friend. I have good reason to believe that the author of the paper in question, if he had had the opportunity of reconsidering the statement of Dr. Fairbairn, would have recognised its incompatibility with the doctrine of the completion of Atonement on the Cross (a doctrine

Digitized by Google

to which the author firmly adhered), and that consequently he would have seen the necessity of disavowing a system which he had inadvertently accredited. We must, however, consider the effects on other minds of this paper, which has now been published in a separate form and widely circulated.

To be (D.V.) continued.

WERTHEIMER, LEA AND CO., PRINTERS, CIRCUS PLACE, FINSBURY CIRCUS.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

No. IV.]

TRACTS ON DOCTRINAL SUBJECTS.

Erroneous Statements

CONCERNING

Atonement and its Results

CONSIDERED.

Part Second.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

LONDON:

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,
12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, LONDON, E.C. 1.

1877.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Erroneous Statements Concerning Atonement and its Results Considered.

THE statements commented on in the preceding Tract, as made in a paper read before a Conference in London, were avowedly derived from the writings of Dr. Fairbairn, who appears to have himself received them chiefly from German sources, and in part, perhaps, from Outram. Dr. Fairbairn's statement will be found in the Appendix.

It will be observed that in this statement, the words "polluted" and "pollution," are twice used and applied to the blood of our holy Substitute up to the time of His death. He is spoken of as "bearing in His Person the consecrated mass of His people's *pollution*," and that "He sunk under the stroke of death *as an outcast from Heaven*." The blood of the victim until death is spoken of "as laden with guilt and pollution;" and incapable, because of pollution, to be "sprinkled," or "laid upon" the altar. In a word, the blood of our

Digitized by Google

Holy Substitute, and consequently His person, are supposed to have been so affected by the imputation of His people's guilt, that until death had taken place, He could neither offer Himself, nor anything connected with Himself, on the altar of God as "an offering of sweet smelling savour."

It will be necessary, therefore, to a considerable extent to repeat the arguments of the preceding Tract. Again, and again, both the Old and New Testaments affirm that there can be no atonement apart from the offering of a "sacrifice of sweet-smelling savour," and they declare that Christ on the cross did offer such sacrifice. "The burnt-offering which was pre-eminently an offering of "sweet savour," was as needful for Atonement as the Sin-offering. See the prominence which was given to the Burnt-offering, and the offering of the incense, in the ceremonies of the great Day of Atonement in the sixteenth of Leviticus—*a chapter which is the analysis or exposition of that which God recognized as presented to Him by His Son on the Cross.* Even in the case of the Sin-offering, though the body of the victim was consumed or burned up (שָׂרַף) without the camp, yet its fat was burnt for fragrance (קָטַר) on the altar. Indeed, everything that was placed upon the altar and offered there (and the blood was offered there) was *ipso facto* an offering of sweet-savour. Of the blood it is expressly said, "I have given it to you *upon the altar* to make an atonement for your souls." Lev. xvii. 11. In the New Testament we read, "Christ gave himself

Digitized by Google

for us an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." Eph. v. 2. Can any words be more express than these? The Cross, therefore, was not *merely* the place where life was laid down under curse; it was also the place where that life and the excellency of Him whose life it was, was presented in all its perfectness unto God. That life ever was, and never could be anything else than pure, holy and blessed. If it had not been so, it could not have been laid down under the curse *atoningly*. It was ever absolutely and essentially perfect; and never was its perfectness more exhibited, and never was that perfectness more estimated by the Father, than during the hours of penal, damnatory suffering on the Cross. *There* His love to the Father, His love to His people, and His obedience to Him whose will He came to fulfil, were put to the full and final test. That awful test, applied in all its unmitigated severity, He met. Well knowing its character, He met it "forsaken" and alone. "What shall I say?" Shall I say, "Father, save me from this hour?" No, "for this cause came I unto this hour. Father glorify thy name." And again, "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God. By the which will we are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus once." This offering was on the Cross. Could we be "sanctified" by the offering of that which was esteemed "polluted," or could anything that was esteemed polluted have been offered at all? Again we read "He offered himself without spot [or unblemished,

Digitized by Google

αμωμον] unto God." And again, The Father "reconciled us in the body of His [Christ's] flesh through death." Col. i., 21, 22. And again, "Redeemed with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." *Τιμιος* (precious) means *esteemed, honoured, honourable.* That could not be called *τιμιος* which was accounted "polluted" and "unclean;" nor would any one who was accounted in any sense "polluted" and as "outcast from heaven," be described as "a Lamb without blemish and without spot." Christ did not become spotless or become entitled to be considered spotless, *by laying down His life;* He was this *before* He laid it down, and *when* He laid it down. All the texts that I have cited are clear and unambiguous, and certainly they are most precious; for they are the very charter of our salvation. Yet not one of them would be true if the blood of our great Substitute had been regarded as "unclean" and "polluted" by imputation, until after death had taken place. If Christ did not offer on the Cross, and lay down on the Cross, a pure and untainted life, and a life regarded as pure and untainted, there has certainly been no atonement. It exists not. We are yet in our sins.

It must be remembered, too, that Christ on the Cross was not only a Sacrifice; He was also a Priest. Throughout the sixteenth of Leviticus (and that is the chapter from which the word "offer," *προσφερω*, so often used in the ninth and tenth of Hebrews is derived) Aaron was "the offerer" (*ὁ προσφερων*).

Digitized by Google

"Offer," therefore, and "offer up" (*αναφερω*), as used in those chapters, are priestly words. The sixteenth of Leviticus could not have been antitypically fulfilled in the manner in which the Apostle in the Hebrews says it was fulfilled, if Jesus at the Cross had not acted as a Priest: nor, according to the Divine ordinances, could Atonement, under any circumstances, be made, without the intervention of a priest. No one but a priest could offer on the altar. Accordingly, the declaration of the New Testament is express that Jesus acted as a Priest "*when He offered up Himself.*" "Such an High Priest became us, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners [*that* He was on earth], and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, first for their own sins to offer up sacrifice, afterwards for those of the people: for this He did ONCE, when He offered up Himself." Now, He could not have thus acted as a Priest if His Person had been regarded as "polluted" by the imputation of sin, or if He had been regarded as "an outcast from heaven." It was necessary that, as a Priest, He should be "holy and unpolluted," (*αμιαντος*) and so regarded by God. If we say that He was not so regarded until after His death, then there could have been no priestly offering on the Cross, and consequently no Atonement.*

* It was probably an oversight that occasioned our English translators, from Wycliff downwards, to render *των ιδιων ἁμαρτιων*, "*his* own sins;" but it is strange that this error

Digitized by Google

Nor must we consider the connection of Priesthood with the offering of atoning sacrifice to be a question of secondary importance. It is a vital question. Perfectness was not required in the sacrifice only; it was required also that He who offered it should manifest, whilst offering, heavenly perfectness of appreciation. It was required of the Priest that both his heart and his lips should "keep knowledge." Christ in undertaking to offer Himself up to God, did so in the full and perfect knowledge of Him unto whom and before whom He offered; for He was the Son of the Father's bosom. His knowledge was in very truth the knowledge of the sanctuary: He understood fully the order and the methods of the House of

---

should have been perpetuated, age after age. Owen rightly says: "*There can be no sacrifice where there is no priest.* And therefore the Socinians, who made the consecration of the Lord Jesus unto His sacerdotal office to be by His entrance into Heaven, do utterly deny His death to have been a sacrifice, but only a preparation for it, as they fancy the killing of the beast of old to have been. And the truth is, either the Lord Christ was a priest *before* and *in* the oblation of Himself on the Cross; or He was never any, nor needed so to be, nor could He so be; for after He was freed from death He had nothing to offer. And it is a strange order of things that the Lord Christ should first offer His only sacrifice, and *after that* be made a Priest." Owen on Heb. vii. p. 26.

This is, therefore, a double contrast in this passage between "those high priests" and Christ. They offered for their own sins: He, as being "holy, harmless, and undefiled," had no sins for which to offer. They offered again and again: He, for His people offered "*once*," and never again. In another Tract, I hope to consider more fully the question of our Lord's Priesthood.

Digitized by Google

God. Knowing God perfectly, He understood and appreciated the essential contrariety that necessarily existed between God and sin. He knew that sin was not merely a moral disease, but that it brought also *criminality* on the sinner—criminality that must, unless removed, entail according to the necessary requirements of the Divine Government, veritable wrath. Jesus, and He alone, could say, with a full appreciation of the meaning of the words He uttered, "O, righteous Father, the world hath not known thee, but I have known thee." The righteousness of the Father, and the world's distance from the Father and from the knowledge of God, the terribleness and extent of the power of Satan, the depth of corruption into which man, both outwardly and inwardly had sank, and all the consequences thereof, were fully appreciated by Him. He knew the terribleness of the wrath that must be met, and the extent and perfectness of the service that must be rendered, in order to free His people from the curse of "the second death," and to provide for them a title to eternal life and to glory.

Perfect acquaintance with God, and perfect communion with Him are manifested in the prayer recorded in the seventeenth of John throughout. That prayer sufficiently indicates the character of the feelings, and the character of the priestly knowledge with which Jesus approached the Cross, there to meet according to God, the appointed wrath—there to render also the oblation of Himself as an offering of

Digitized by Google

sweet-smelling savour. Perfectness was not only required in the offering: perfectness also was required in the Priest who offered it. The holy linen vestments with which, on the great day of Atonement, the typical Priest was clothed, was but an imperfect type of the essential purity that attached inwardly and outwardly to the true High Priest when He approached the Cross, there to offer unto God in His heavenly sanctuary the true oblation. Faith sees Him bearing, indeed, as the victim the judgment due to His people's iniquities, and enduring veritable wrath; but no infliction of wrath could take from Him His own essential unchangeable characteristics, or destroy His power of serving and glorifying God in the fires, and offering there His priestly oblation with a full, perfect, appreciation of the holiness of God, and a full, perfect appreciation of the heinousness and consequences of sin. Faith sees Him, therefore, not as "polluted," or as rendered "unclean" by the imputation of our sins, nor regarded as "an outcast from heaven." On the contrary, it sees Him as the Heavenly One, overcoming, in the title of His own essential holiness, all the consequences of the imputation of our sin. Heaven was indeed open over the Cross dispensing wrath. "It pleased Jehovah to bruise him," and "to make his soul an offering for sin;" but Heaven was also open to receive in return, and it *did* receive in return, the incense-like fragrance of the accepted oblation of the Holy One.—Him in whom the Father had ever delighted, and in

Digitized by Google

whom He delighted still, even whilst He was bruising Him. The utterance of the Father's heart still was, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased." The twenty-second Psalm may be regarded as being in an especial sense, the Psalm of the Cross. There we find the words, "I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and THOU hast brought me into the dust of death." Yet, before we reach the end of this Psalm, words of sorrow suddenly cease, and give place to words of joy, thanksgiving, and praise. "Thou hast heard me . . . I will declare Thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will I praise Thee." The Psalm of the Cross does not end without thus markedly attesting that the acceptableness of the Offerer and the acceptableness of the oblation He was making, had been recognised on high.*

It is very evident that they who speak of the Lord

---

* The 19th and three following verses of Psalm xxii. literally translated, are:—

But thou, O Jehovah be not far away;
O my strength, unto my help hasten.
Deliver from the sword my soul,
My solitary one from the power of the dog.
Save me from the mouth of the lion, [ME.
And from the horns of the buffaloes. THOU HAST ANSWERED
I will declare thy name unto my brethren:
In the midst of the congregation I will praise thee.

Digitized by Google

Christ being, as a Substitute, polluted or defiled by the imputation of His people's sins, have utterly misconceived the nature both of substitution and of imputation. It is essential to accepted substitution that the person of the Substitute should be regarded through His whole service as personally free from the taint of the sin whose punishment He is vicariously enduring. As respects "*imputation,*" the advocates of the system we are considering, cannot be said to hold the doctrine of "imputation" at all; for although they use the word "imputation," it is clear that in their use of it, it means *impartation.* Otherwise, they could not speak of the blood, or life of Christ being regarded as "unclean," or "polluted," nor would they with Mr. Macintosh, speak of "sin attaching to the life which the Lord Jesus laid down on the Cross." *Macintosh, Notes on Genesis,* p. 71.

Never, during any part of His work as the Sin-bearer, did our Substitute cease to be recognised by God as personally standing in that isolation of holiness which pertained to Him as One from whom the absolute perfectness of heaven was inseparable. When we speak of Him as bearing our sin, we do not mean that He took or received the taint or pollution (macula) of our sin. We mean simply, that as One avowedly retaining His own essential perfectness, He took on Himself the *reatus* or legal ascription of our guilt, so as to subject Himself to the penalties voluntarily incurred by Him because of such ascription.

Digitized by Google

Never, either at the Incarnation, or at the Cross, did He identify Himself with our moral condition, or receive its taint. He voluntarily met the penalties appointed to Him as the Substitute, because of the sin that attached to the moral condition of His people; but that is a very different thing from making their moral condition, or its taint, *His*. Christ, *personally regarded*, was perfect and worthy of all blessing when (because of the demerit of His people) He received the stroke due to their sins: they, *personally regarded*, are imperfect and worthy of all curse when (because of His merits) they are justified. Through faith God "justifies the ungodly:" and justification, be it remembered, is not merely pardon. On the heads of the justified all the infinite meritoriousness of their Divine Substitute rests for ever. The imputation of the value of that meritoriousness is the ground on which all the blessings given to the redeemed, whether in time or in eternity, are granted. Union in life with Christ through the Spirit, and also all the consequences that flow from His being the King, Priest, Advocate, Bishop, Friend, Brother, and Husband of His people are covenanted (and therefore secure) blessings procured for us solely by the meritoriousness sacrificially presented for us when our Divine Substitute finished His one oblation on the Cross. This it is that gives to the Cross its pre-eminence, and extends the value of the service there rendered, over all that we shall be in eternity, as well as all that we are in time.

Digitized by Google

Even our being made like to Him in glory, when we shall bear the image of the Heavenly, as we have hitherto borne the image of the earthy, is but the result—the appointed necessary consequence of our having been accepted according to the value of the meritoriousness presented for us on the Cross.

"The Scriptures plainly teach, that all the guilt or obligation to punishment incurred by the sins of His people, was imputed or charged to the account of Christ, as the legal ground of the execution upon Him of the penalty involved in the case. Yet, notwithstanding that the guilt of all our sins is thus charged to Christ, and expiated in Him, all their blame, shame, and pollution, and power, as inherent personal habits or principles, remain all the while inalienably ours. These sins are none the less ours, after their imputation to Him, than they were before. First.—The very force of the imputation is to make Him, "*alienæ culpæ reus,*" that is, penally responsible for *another's sin.* They must remain ours in order that they may be to Him the sins of another. II.—Because *personal moral qualities, and the pollution inherent in sinful ones, are inalienable and cannot be transferred by imputation.* III.—Because, as Owen pointed out long ago, to "*alienæ culpæ reus,*" makes no man a sinner subjectively considered, unless he did unwisely or irregularly undertake the responsibility. IV.—Because our blessed Lord was a Divine person, and therefore absolutely incapable of personal sin in any sense or degree. While, therefore,

Digitized by Google

He bore our sins, and consequently suffered the penalty involved . . . . He was all the while not one iota the less personally immaculate and glorious in holiness, and all the more the well-beloved Son of the Father, in whom he was well-pleased. "All this the orthodox have always held and carefully expressed." *Hodge on the Atonement*, p. 161.

The principles laid down in this passage are true. Christ by submitting to the imputation of our demerit, and charging Himself with the burden of our guilt, was not made personally, or regarded as being made personally, one whit less holy than He was before such imputation, nor are we *by the fact of the imputation* of His merits, made personally less unworthy than we were before such imputation. Gifts of grace bestowed on all believers, through the spirit; present deliverance from the *control*, though not from the presence of Sin, final conformation to the likeness of Christ in glory, and other like mercies, are consequences—necessary inseparable consequences of the imputation of Christ's merits; but these consequences are not to be confounded with the imputation itself. Yet these principles (absolutely essential though they be to a right reception of the doctrine of Atonement as taught in the Scripture) are utterly set aside by all who teach that Christ was so affected by the imputation of His people's sin as to be unfitted, whilst bearing it, to be an offering of sweet savour. If His life, or blood, were regarded by God as "unclean," or "polluted," until

Digitized by Google

He had laid it down, there certainly could have been no "offering" on the Cross at all. And seeing that no atoning offering could be made *after* death, it must follow that there has been no atonement, and as Owen has rightly said, "*never can be.*" Are we willing thus to abandon the doctrine of the Apostles, and to follow Socinus? Through inadvertence we may be betrayed into paths, the character and end of which we little know when we enter them.

We have to remember also, that there can be no atoning oblation without an altar. If the blood of our holy Substitute was regarded as "polluted" until His death had taken place, how could it have been offered at all? On what altar could it have been offered? There is no burnt-offering altar in heaven, nor anything that answers thereunto. Once, and once only, (εφαπαξ) did Christ "offer for sins." He offered on the Cross, and thereby the Cross becomes our altar. Men led the Holy One to it as the place of dishonour and curse; and the place of dishonour and curse it was. It was needful that the sin-offering should be taken to a place "without the gate" to be "burned up in the fire of wrath—שְׂרֵפָה. But He whom they led "without the gate," was not only the sin-offering. Atonement could not be accomplished by the sin-offering *alone.* He was also the burnt-offering, and moreover, a Priest —a Priest of a heavenly Sanctuary, and therefore one who was not regarded as belonging to the earth or to any system that had been framed for earth. The

Digitized by Google

moment, therefore, that Jesus made on the Cross the oblation of Himself to God, He made the Cross an altar. Thence the fragrance of the sacrifice of sweet-smelling savour ascended; and heaven recognised, received, and rejoiced in it. Therefore, though we see in the Cross the place of death, judgment, wrath and curse, we see in it *also* the place where an oblation more precious than our hearts can conceive, was offered; the excellency whereof brings to us an acceptableness before God that covers us now, continues with us during our tarriance on earth, accompanies us into heaven, and abides with us there as the meritorious ground of our blessedness for ever, and for ever.

In token of the acceptableness of the blood thus presented for atonement unto God, the children of Israel were commanded to bring their sacrifices "to the Lord unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest, and offer them for peace-offerings unto the Lord. And the priest shall sprinkle [or more properly, "scatter"] the blood *upon the altar of the Lord* at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and burn the fat for a sweet savour unto the Lord. Lev. xvii. 5. And again, "I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls." Blessed texts to those who recognise the preciousness of that blood once offered for them on the Cross. But what does Dr. Fairbairn see in the blood thus offered? In his judgment "the blood offered on the altar represented *the blood or soul of the offerer* who thus saw him-

Digitized by Google

self through the action of the blood of his victim re-established in communion with God, and solemnly received back into the Divine favour and fellowship." Is our "blood or soul" capable of being burned on the altar for a sweet savour? Is our blood or soul capable of being given for atonement on the altar? Is atonement made by our blood or life being brought into a condition of purity like unto the blood or life of Him who gave Himself for us? Christ's blood is never said in the Scripture to represent ours in the sense that Fairbairn means. The blood of the typical victim may be said to have represented Christ's blood, but Christ offered His own blood, and His blood was the blood not of a mere man, but of Immanuel—one who was God "manifest in the flesh." He shed and offered it in a place where we dared not to appear. We could neither have borne the wrath of the living God, nor have presented a sacrifice of sweet smelling savour. The presentation of the blood on the altar represented something that Christ did *in order to bring us by atonement* into a condition of acceptance—how then could it represent us *as having been brought* into a condition of acceptance? When the guilt of our sin was charged upon our holy Substitute, it did not, as Fairbairn imagines, cause "pollution" to attach to Him, and unfit Him for offering acceptably unto God whilst He hung upon the Cross. Nor, on the other hand, is His purity so infused into us, nor do we become so identified with the blood—so possessed of its distinctive characteristics, as to be, when justified,

Digitized by Google

rendered meet to be presented on the altar, where the blood was presented atoningly. The acceptableness of the blood stands *in designed contrast with* the personal unacceptableness of those in whose stead it is offered. The believer does not regard it as representing *his* life or soul, but as representing the holy life of a Divine Substitute, laid down because of His people's sin. Such is the doctrine of the Scripture: but such is not the doctrine of those German systems, within the circle of whose influence Dr. Fairbairn appears to have been inadvertently drawn. It was an evil hour when the Evangelicalism of Scotland and England allowed the solid doctrines of such writers as *Witsius* and *Turretine* to be superseded by the emptiness and error of modern German theology.

APPENDIX.

THE following is the quotation from Fairbairn on which the preceding remarks are founded:—See "Typology," Vol. II., pp. 316, 317.

"'This sprinkling of the blood,' Outram remarks, 'was by much the most sacred part of the entire service, since it was that by which the life and soul of the victim were considered to be given to God as supreme Lord of life and death; for what was placed upon the altar of God was supposed, according to the religion of the Old Testament, to be rendered to Him.' But in what relation did the blood stand, when thus rendered to God? Was it as still charged with the guilt of the offerer, and underlying the sentence of God's righteous condemnation?

Digitized by Google

So the language just quoted would seem to import. But how then shall we meet the objection, which naturally arises on such a supposition, that a polluted thing was laid upon the altar of God? And how could the blood with propriety be regarded as so holy when sprinkled on the altar, that it sanctified whatever it touched?"

Fairbairn says "IT" [the blood] "was still charged with the guilt of the offerer," &c. Where, in Scripture, do we read of *the blood* of the Great Offerer being charged with any thing that was not charged upon His holy Person? The blood cannot be thus separated from the Person of Him whose blood it was.

The expression "charged with guilt" is ambiguous. It may mean "charged with guilt" in the sense in which we apply the expression to one who is *personally* chargeable, and is therefore himself polluted: or it may be used of one who, being recognised as free from all personal charge, is, nevertheless, charged as one who has taken upon himself the responsibility of others' guilt. To be charged with guilt *personally;* and to be charged with guilt *imputatively on account of others*, are two very different conditions. The German system, which Fairbairn unhappily follows, fails to distinguish them, and by so failing renders atonement on the Cross impossible, just in the way that the Socinians do. To be charged with guilt *imputatively* on account of others, brings no pollution on the Substitute personally. He, His Person, His life, and His blood, are free from all pollution, and are so regarded by Him who accepts His substitutional service.

Digitized by Google

Fairbairn proceeds :—

"We present the following as in our judgment the true representation of the matter: By the offerer's bringing his victim, and with imposition of hands confessing over it his sins, it became symbolically a personation of sin, and hence must forthwith bear the penalty of sin—death."

Christ never became "a *personation* of sin." He was the personation of holiness, bearing that which was due to the guilt of others charged upon Him whilst recognised as being *personally* "holy, harmless," and, in all respects, "undefiled." Otherwise He could not have been a Substitute.

Fairbairn is quite in error in supposing that confession of sin, or transfer of sin, is the *exclusive* thought in the typical act of placing the hand on the head of the victim. Indeed, though the hand of the offerer was laid on the head of the Burnt-offering, Sin-offering, and Trespass-offering, there is in neither case any *mention* of confession of sin. It is only *mentioned* in the case of the goat sent on the Day of Atonement into the wilderness.

The word translated in our version "put" ["he shall put his hand upon the head," &c.] is first used in Leviticus of the Burnt-offering (See Lev. i. 4), as also subsequently of the Peace-offering and Sin-offering. It properly means, "to place, or lay something upon any thing, so that it may rest upon it and be sudported by it." *Gesenius.* See Amos v. 8: "And *leaned* his hand upon the wall." The offerer, therefore, by this act indicated that he was *devoid* of all the

Digitized by Google

qualities that characterised the victim on which he rested his hand, and indicated also that he relied on the unblemished and acceptable victim which was to be substituted in his room *for the supply unto God of those qualities which were absent from himself:* and among those qualities was included, not only the capacity of bearing wrath, but also the meetness for being burned for fragrance on the altar of God. This is a very different thought from that which the language of Fairbairn presents to us.

Fairbairn continues:—

"When this was done, the offerer was himself free alike from sin [he was freed not from sin, but *from the imputation* of sin] and from its penalty. But was the transaction by which this was effected owned by God? And was the offerer again restored, as one possessed of pure and blessed life, to the favour and fellowship of God? It was to testify of these things—the most important in the whole transaction—that the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar took place. Having with his own hands executed the deserved penalty on the victim, the offerer gave the blood to the priest, as God's representative. But that blood had already paid, in death, the penalty of sin, and was no longer laden with guilt and pollution."

This statement is most objectionable. In the first place, it is not correct to say that "the blood" had paid the penalty. The substitute paid the penalty by shedding His blood as pure and holy blood. If "the blood" had been "laden with guilt and pollution," the Person of the Substitute would have been laden with guilt and pollution. The blood, whether poured at the bottom of the altar, or scattered for acceptance on

Digitized by Google

the altar, or sprinkled for the purification and hallowment of any thing, was always recognised as pure, and as being the blood of a victim that was pure.

Fairbairn adds :—

"The justice of God was (symbolically) satisfied concerning it, and by the hands of His own representative He could with perfect consistence receive it as a pure and spotless thing, the very image of His own holiness, upon His table or altar. In being received there, however, it still represented the blood or soul of the offerer, who thus saw himself, through the action with the blood of his victim, re-established in communion with God, and solemnly recognised as received back to the divine favour and fellowship."

["*That blood . . . . was no longer*," says Dr. Fairbairn, "*laden with guilt and pollution. The justice of God was (symbolically) satisfied concerning it*," etc.] This is utterly untrue. The doctrine of this system is, that God was not satisfied with the blood of Jesus, because of the pollution which is falsely supposed to have attached to it until death, when the pollution is supposed to have been removed. But God was *always* satisfied with the blood of Jesus. His blood, like Himself, was *always* *αμιαντος—undefiled.* (Heb. vii.) It was so during His life, during His crucifixion, and at and after His death. It was blood, pure and holy,—shed, because He whose blood it was, had undertaken to remove by the offering of His own pure and holy self under wrath, the penalties due to those who were not pure and holy, but polluted.

How could blood presented on the altar for *atonement* (for that was the reason why the blood was "scattered

Digitized by Google

on the altar") represent the soul of the offerer? Was *that* presented for atonement? And if the blood so presented on the altar as being "pure and spotless" represented the soul of the worshipper, then the soul of the worshipper must have become pure and spotless, and "*the very image of God's* own holiness." Is this language to apply to the soul of a believer? Are our souls made, at the moment of our acceptance, as pure and spotless as the soul of our Substitute? Rome and Mysticism may teach this; but the Scripture does not. The doctrine of Scripture, and of all the orthodox Protestant confessions, is, that although in this world our souls never become "the very image of God's own holiness," yet we are nevertheless allowed to draw nigh, even into the Holiest of all, because of the imputation of the value of the sacrificial merits of Another, and solely because of that imputation.

Fairbairn further says:—

"How exactly this representation accords with what is written of Christ, must be obvious on the slightest reflection. When dying as man's substitute and representative, He appeared laden with the guilt of innumerable sins, as one who, though He knew no sin, yet had 'been made sin,' bearing in His person the concentrated mass of His people's pollution; and on this account He received upon His head the curse due to sin, and sank under the stroke of death, as an outcast from heaven. But the moment He gave up the ghost, an end was made of sin. With the pouring out of His soul unto death, its guilt and curse were exhausted for all who should be heirs of salvation. Godhead was completely glorified concerning it; and when the life laid down in ignominy and shame was again resumed in honour and triumph, and this, or the blood in

Digitized by Google

which it resided, was presented before the Father in the heavenly places, it bespoke His people's acceptance in Him to the possession of a life out of death, to nearest fellowship with God, and the perpetual enjoyment of the divine favour; so that they are even said to 'sit with Him in heavenly places,' and to have 'their life hid with Him in God.' Hence also the peculiar force and significancy of the expression in 1 Peter i., 2, formerly explained—'unto,' not only obedience, but also 'sprinkling of the blood of Jesus;' in other words, unto the participation of His risen, divine, heavenly life—a life that is replete with the favour and partakes of the blessedness of God."

When Dr. Fairbairn states that after the blood of Jesus had been resumed in resurrection, God "could with perfect consistence receive it as a pure and spotless thing, the very image of His own holiness, upon His table or altar," we have to ask, "On what altar?" There could be only "one offering" (*προσφορα*) of the blood, "once" (*εφαπαξ*) made: and that offering was finished on the altar of the Cross. There could be no offering (*προσφορα*) of Himself, either in earth or in heaven after that.

Dr. Fairbairn, however, maintains that there was this second presentation of the blood on the table or altar of God after resurrection, and says that it "still represented the blood or soul of the offerer." Now Christ never represented the offerer, in the sense Dr. Fairbairn means. Christ as the Substitute stands *contrasted* with the condition of those for whom He offered—He *pure*, they *impure*. Substitution is not exchange of personal condition. The German system, by which Dr. Fairbairn has been beguiled, is one of

Digitized by Google

commutation, not of imputation. It rejects substitutional imputation. Christ, or His life, is supposed to be commuted into the moral condition of the sinner (a condition which if He had ever entered, He would have never emerged from it again); and the justified, at the moment of their justification, are supposed to be commuted into a condition of purity like unto His: which, if it were true, would make them absolutely perfect. Christ's condition as the Substitute, stood in direct *contrast* with the condition of those for whom He suffered. His personal condition when He suffered, was not like unto theirs: nor did their personal condition after He had suffered and made atonement, become instantly like unto His. The bearer of a burden is to be distinguished from the burden that He bears. A holy Substitute retaining His holiness whilst bearing penalties due to others, is something very different from a representative so associated with the impurity and pollution of those for whom He suffers, as to be divested of His own personal characteristics.

[*Re-established in communion with God.*] The justified sinner may be said to be brought into communion with God; but he cannot be said to be *re*-established in communion with Him, for, before justification, he was dead in trespasses and sins, full of living and active enmity against God. Nor does redemption bring back into that condition which Adam (who although innocent was earthy) had in Paradise before he sinned.

Digitized by Google

God has granted to the redeemed, union with Christ, the Second Man, in the glory of the new creation. "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the Second Man is the Lord from heaven." "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." *In Christ* the redeemed possess heavenly life in glory. Their "life is hid with him in God." They are quickened in the power of that life (ζωη, not ψυχη) which Christ as the ὁ ζων—the living One (see Rev. i. 18) had with the Father before the world was. When John beheld in vision Christ in the glorious power of that life, he fell at His feet as dead. The life to which the Lord Jesus refers when He speaks of Himself as the Living One (ὁ ζων) was not the life (ψυχη) which He laid down at the Cross and resumed at resurrection. That life indeed—the life that He had as man was essentially holy, pure, and blessed. As the Living One He assumed it and laid it down for the redemption of His people: having laid it down, He re-assumed the same life (ψυχην, see John x. 17, 18) in token that their redemption was complete. When, therefore, the Lord speaks of Himself, or is spoken of as "the Life-giving One" (ὁ ζωην διδους, John vi. 33., or as "the quickening spirit" (πνευμα ζωοποιουν, 1 Cor. xv.), He does not refer to the life (ψυχη) which He had as man, but to the life which He had from everlasting as one with the Father, and with the Holy Ghost. "The life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness and shew unto you that eternal life

Digitized by Google

which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." (1 John i. 2.) It is in the power of this life that believers are quickened: and ability to live in the full power thereof will be granted to them when their Lord returns, and when, in the twinkling of an eye, they shall be changed into His risen likeness. In the change thus communicated unto them by His almighty power, they find their meetness for life in glory. But the German system, which Dr. Fairbairn was drawn into, admits not of these things. When the Apostle speaks of believers as being elect unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, Dr. Fairbairn understands these last words—"sprinkling of the *blood* of Jesus Christ," as referring to the participation of His risen, divine, heavenly *life*—a life which is replete with the favour and partakes of the blessedness of God.

In Dr. Fairbairn's judgment, the words "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus," refer not to the being placed by God under the shelter and value of the atoning death of Jesus, but they are supposed to refer to the *impartation* of His life, for he uses the word "*participation.*" Thus, *impartation* and *participation* are made a necessary part of justification. The great Protestant Articles which says, "We are accounted righteous before God ONLY on account of [*propter*] the merit of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ through faith [*per fidem*]"—is abandoned. We must join Bunsen and the Essayists, and speak of the Protestant doctrine of "merit by

Digitized by Google

transfer" as "a fiction:" we must forsake Melancthon and Luther, and unite with the theologians of Trent. In this system, too, no distinction is made between the life (ψυχη) which the Lord had as man, and which He laid down and resumed, and the life (ζωη) which He had from everlasting with the Father. It ignores also the communication of life (ζωη) unto us by the power of the Spirit creating in us "the new man"—one of the great results of Atonement; and it ignores also the doctrine of union with Christ in heavenly places, as our new federal Head—the last Adam. It sets aside this doctrine, *as it is taught in Scripture*, and substitutes for it a *supposed* offering of the blood of Christ in Heaven.

It is melancholy to think of the process by which such a mind as that of Dr. Fairbairn, could be brought to unite with those who refuse to admit that everything necessary to the "justification" (δικαιωμα) and "cleansement" (καθαρισμος) of believers was accomplished at the Cross. It is sorrowful to hear him speak of the offering or presentation of the blood in heaven after the Resurrection. It is still more sorrowful to find him maintaining that such [supposed] presentation of the blood was the presentation of "life out of death," and that by such presentation of *life*, the Scripture which speaks of our being "seated in heavenly places," together with Christ, was fulfilled. If, as I have already said, "The sprinkling of the blood of Jesus," which is absolutely essential to our justification,

Digitized by Google

means "participation of His divine, heavenly life," then, such participation and communication of life becomes in part the ground of our justification, which is just what Rome and Mysticism teach.

One whose name is well known and would (were I to mention it) carry with it deserved weight, writes in reference to these things, "The fear of God is passing from men's minds, and, for aught I see to the contrary, Protestantism may soon be as unsound and unscriptural as either the Greek or Papal type of doctrine."

May God give us grace to lay these words of warning to heart; for they are true. The truths for which our forefathers struggled unto death, are, one after another, being betrayed. It is well that we should ask ourselves, whether, if we waver now and compromise, we have any reason to think that we shall not waver and compromise when Antichristianism comes in its fulness. It is very evident that the old foundations of things, both in the Church and in the world, are being broken up, and new foundations are being prepared. At such a juncture it behoves us to take heed that no self-interest, no attachment to individuals or to systems, interfere with our supreme attachment to Revealed Truth.

The infinite value of Revealed Truth, and the vast importance of following its guidance and upholding its supremacy, is recognised fully now, by all our brethren who have entered into their rest. Their present desire (could they express it to us) would be,

Digitized by Google

not that we should strengthen the influence of anything that they may have erroneously said or written, but that we should counteract it. As for ourselves, we have to remember the words, "My brethren be not many teachers (διδασκαλοι), knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation." These are solemn words. Self-complacency, censoriousness, and pride, cannot reign in any heart that gives heed to this warning. We have all need to say, "If thou, Lord, wert to mark what is done amiss, O Lord, who shall stand. But there is forgiveness with thee that thou mightest be feared." "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified."

Yet a sense of our responsibility must not prevent us from declaring that which we see and know to be revealed in the Word of God. "God has not given to us the spirit of timidity (δειλιας), but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." (2 Timothy i. 7). God has committed to His people the deposit of His Truth. As the Levites of old bore through the wilderness, with careful and reverend hand, the vessels and curtains, and sockets, and pins, of the Tabernacle, so have we to keep and watch over His Truth in its lesser as well as its greater parts. "That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." (2 Timothy i. 14). We stand in the midst of the world and of the professing Church. We are as "in a large house" in which are many

Digitized by Google

persons and many things,—"some unto honour, others unto dishonour." We have to associate ourselves with the one, and to sever ourselves from the other. Observe, too, the Apostle's charge to Timothy respecting the maintenance and perpetuation of true ministry amongst God's people. "The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, suited or adapted (*ἱκανοις*) to teach others also." (2 Timothy ii. 2). Timothy could not *create* ministry. He could not supply either men that were "faithful," or men that were "suited to teach." The provision of such can come only from God. We cannot expect blessing if we go before God in these things, and act when He has not given the means of acting with effect. To seek to gather together the children of God is one thing; to gather them together to the Truth and methods of God is quite another. They will be gathered for evil, and not for good, if gathered to the figments and imaginations of our own minds, and not to the revealed Truth of God. Thou "hast magnified Thy Word above all Thy name." No association or union can be truly blessed that is association and union unguided by Truth.

To be (D.V.) continued.

ERRATUM IN NO. III., PAGE 9, FIRST LINE.

For, "*it was in no respect more pure and holy when He laid it down than when He took it again,*"
Read, "*it was in no respect more pure and holy when He took it again than it was when He laid it down.*"

Wertheimer, Lea & Co., Printers, Finsbury Circus.

Digitized by Google

No. V.]

TRACTS ON DOCTRINAL SUBJECTS.

Erroneous Statements

CONCERNING

Atonement and its Results

CONSIDERED.

Part Third.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

LONDON:

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,
12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, LONDON, E.C. 1.

1877.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Erroneous Statements Concerning Atonement and its Results Considered.

In the extract from Fairbairn, given in the preceding Tract, it will be remembered that the Lord Jesus is spoken of as bearing in His person "the concentrated mass of His people's pollution," and of sinking under the stroke of death as an "outcast from heaven." These two expressions, "pollution" and "outcast from heaven" are utterly incapable of being justified. They are altogether (not to use a stronger term) inadmissible, as well as the expressions "unclean" and "accursed"—both which expressions were used at the London Meeting. No one who speaks of the blood or life of the Lord Jesus being regarded as "polluted," or "unclean," or "accursed" until it was laid down in death, can hold the doctrine of atonement as taught in Scripture. If, as I have again and again said, "the blood or life" of the Lord Jesus was, until He had died, regarded as "unclean," or "polluted,"

Digitized by Google

there could have been no offering of a sweet-smelling savour presented on the Cross; and without such an offering there could have been no atonement. It was not the *infusion* of our sin or pollution into our Substitute, that became the ground of His suffering; for such infusion there neither was, nor could be; nor did the *infusion* of His perfectness become to us the ground of justification and acceptance. *Christ* retained His personal perfectness and worthiness when suffering under the imputation of our guilt: *we*, when placed under the acceptableness of His merits, are personally imperfect and unworthy. "It is an absurdity," says Dr. Hodge, "for which no class of Reformed Theologians have ever been responsible, to represent personal character, either good or bad, as transferable from one person to another by imputation. All that can be imputed from person to person is *the guilt or legal obligation to punishment of any sin*, and that, only in those cases in which the person to whom it is imputed has become in some way or other justly responsible for the action of the person the guilt of whose sin is imputed." p. 159. This statement, so important and so true, is utterly set aside by all who say, with Dr. Fairbairn, that the "life or blood" of our Substitute was regarded as "polluted" until His death, but that afterwards, having (it is supposed) been freed from pollution by death, it communicated to us a purity so absolute that when the blood of the sacrifice was sprinkled on the altar, *our* "blood or

Digitized by Google

life" was represented thereby!! No condition of purity could of course be greater than this.

In the paper read at the London Meeting, the statement of Fairbairn respecting the blood of our Substitute being, until after His death, regarded as polluted, was unreservedly maintained. The communication of purity to us was also maintained, although not precisely in the same language that Fairbairn had employed. The statements made at the London Meeting on this subject are, however, too important to be dismissed cursorily. They deserve close and careful consideration. They indicate too clearly a current of thought virtually identical with that of Fairbairn—a current that is extensively setting in in various quarters, and carrying far away from the doctrine of Holy Scripture respecting Atonement and its results.

It was stated at the Meeting that Christ entered into heaven "*with* His own blood." "That blood" (it was added) "was *life* after death, and out of death." *

The Scripture does not say that Christ entered *with* His own blood. The passage from which these words are quoted is Heb. ix. 12. That passage speaks of Christ's entrance into heaven after His resurrection, and tells us that *by means of* (διὰ) His blood He was able to enter heaven as One who *had obtained* (εὑραμενος) everlasting redemption for His people.† In other

* The italics are mine.

† I hope to consider this passage—Heb. ix. 12—fully in a subsequent Tract.

Digitized by Google

words, His blood which He had shed and offered unto God in death, gave Him a title to enter as One who had completed the work He had undertaken, and who had won for His people the redemption that He had quitted heaven to gain for them. "*By means* of His blood" He entered as One whose triumph was complete. In discussing a subsequent branch of this subject, we shall see the vast importance of quoting this passage correctly, and refusing to substitute "*with*" for "*by means of*." "Christ," says Owen, "offered Himself *before* His entrance into the holy place not made with hands, and then entered thereinto, to appear in the presence of God for us. Christ entered by His own blood into the holy place, inasmuch as, having shed *and offered* His blood a sacrifice to God, *with the efficacy of it* He entered into His presence to carry on the work of His priesthood in His intercession for us."—*Owen on Christ's Priestly Office*, Vol. xii. p. 407. The Socinians teach that Christ entered *to offer* in heaven. The mis-quotation, "with his own blood," suits their system well.

But now observe the words that follow: That blood (the blood "with" which He is supposed to have entered at His ascension) is said to have been "life after death, and out of death."

Now most unquestionably the blood that is mentioned in Heb. ix. 12, is the blood that Christ shed on the Cross when He there "offered himself without spot to God," and by which He "obtained eternal re-

Digitized by Google

demption for us." Consequently, it does not represent *life out of death;* but it emphatically represents *life laid down,* that is to say, death. It is the blood of expiation—expiation made unto God *by death.* The Scripture says that the life, or principle of natural vitality, is in the blood whilst the blood remains in that relation to the body which God by creation has assigned to it; but the Scripture does not say that vitality attaches to the blood when the blood has been *poured out* and separated from the flesh to which it pertains. The blood whilst in the body represents life in exercise; the blood when shed still represents life, but *life laid down;* and it is when speaking of it in this last relation that God said, "I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls;" and this great fact, namely, the fact of its being devoted to God to make expiation to Him, is the reason why it is not to be eaten by man. The blood shed, the blood *offered on the altar,* the blood "scattered," and the blood *sprinkled,* was the blood of the same victim, and was in either case, whether "shed," "offered," "scattered" on the altar, or "sprinkled," the blood of life laid down, *i.e.,* the blood of death. "He poured out his soul unto death." The Father reconciled us "in the body of his [Christ's] flesh through death." Col. i. 22. The blood, therefore, by means of which Christ entered heaven *as One who had obtained eternal redemption for His people,* by shedding and offering it on the Cross, was the blood of death. It was life "poured out." There is not a

Digitized by Google

passage either in Leviticus, or in Hebrews, or indeed in any part of Scripture, that speaks either typically or literally of the blood of Jesus (whether as "*shed*," or "*offered*," or "*scattered*," or "*sprinkled*") that does not refer exclusively to the blood shed in death. The blood so spoken of does not indicate life continued, or life resumed, but life *resigned*. We are "sanctified" (and if sanctified, certainly "cleansed") "by the offering of the body of Jesus once." Heb. x. 10. The Scripture declares that the whole family of faith were simultaneously sprinkled, reconciled, and justified by the blood shed, offered, and accepted for them on the Cross. The Scripture affirms that no one who is not sprinkled by the blood shed on the Cross, can be either in a condition of reconciliation, or of justification before God. But this system affirms the very reverse. It not only teaches that "it is the blood of sprinkling which *cleanses* us, and it is the blood of atonement which *reconciles* us to God" [that statement is in itself subversive of all that Scripture teaches on the subject, for none can be "reconciled" who are not "sprinkled"] but it further asserts that the sprinkling is not an imputation to us of the value of the blood of atonement shed and offered for us on the Cross (*that*, it is said, would not cleanse us), but the sprinkling is supposed to be a communication or impartation of the blood as *life*—"sanctification by the imparted power of His life." If this were so, we could no longer speak of being cleansed by the blood of the Cross, or say that the Son

Digitized by Google

of God did by His death effect "the cleansement of our sins:" we must say that we are cleansed by the *communication* of His life, and not by His blood shed in death: and we must further believe, according to this system, that His blood shed in death could not cleanse, because until death it was regarded as "unclean" and "polluted;" but that when resumed in resurrection His blood became the representative of a pure life, and that our cleansing is effected by *impartation* of that pure life and its diffusion through our souls. This surely is a different gospel from that which the Apostle preached, and that which was, through God's mercy, at the Reformation revived.

And observe how this cleansing of our souls is described. "When it [the blood] is sprinkled on our souls, it imparts to us, not merely or mainly the death that was endured for sin, but the life of Christ in its cleansing, hallowing, sanctifying power." In what sense can it be said that the blood of Christ imparts to us the death that was endured for sin? I cannot, and do not suppose that this statement was intended to sustain the doctrine of the mystics, and to teach that the impartation of the blood of Christ as the power of life, causes an inward crucifixion of self similar to that of Christ upon the Cross, and that by such inward crucifixion we become sanctified and reconciled. I do not suppose that this is meant, yet surely the words employed in the extract given tends greatly to encourage those who do make such statements. We

Digitized by Google

may rightly say that God imparts to believers all the blessings that are the result and purchase of Christ's blood once shed upon the Cross; but to say that Christ's *blood* imparts to us death, is incomprehensible. Nor on the other hand does His blood "impart" to us life. It is the price whereby life and every other blessing bestowed on us in time or in eternity is purchased for us; but the blood does not impart to us life, or become our life. It is not in respect of the pure and holy life (ψυχη) that Christ had as man, and which He laid down and took again—it is not in respect of *that* life (ψυχη) that He is called the quickening or life-giving One (ο ζωοποιων). He was from everlasting "the Life;" the Living One (ὁ ζων) before He took flesh, and was made in the likeness of man, and it is in the power of that Life which He retained when He became the Second Man that He quickens His people. "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul (ψυχη ζωσα), the last Adam was made a quickening spirit" (πνευμα ζωοποιουν). The blood, therefore, which He shed as man (though it is not the blood of a mere man, but the blood of Immanuel—One who was God manifest in the flesh) is not to be confounded with the new life (ζωη) which we receive from Christ as the quickening One (ὁ ζωοποιων) through the Spirit. The impartation of life is the work of the Spirit, whereby "the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," is formed in us. Eph. iv. 24. The Spirit, also,

Digitized by Google

as the Paraclete, comes to dwell in those who are thus quickened. To confound, therefore, between the work of Christ in redemption, and the work of Christ and of the Spirit in imparting new life and in sustaining the life so imparted, is fatal to a right apprehension of the methods of God, and to a right confession of the faith delivered to the saints to keep.

It was further said: "That life [viz., Christ's] which bore in death the curse and penalty of sin, survives in perfect purity, and we become partakers of it by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, so that the soul is purged from defilement by having His life diffused all over it and through it."

Observe the words: "That life which bore in death the curse and penalty of sin." Where does the Scripture speak of Christ's *life* or *blood* bearing the curse or penalty of sin? We read of Christ Himself bearing the curse, but we do not read of His life or blood *separately* bearing it. Any tendency to separate Christ's person from His life or blood in the manner here done must be vigilantly resisted. Many are now teaching that Christ took upon Him man's tainted life: that He laid it down, divesting Himself of it as of a garment, and thereby reconciled man's *nature* unto God: that He then took a new life that was untainted, and so brought back *humanity* in a condition of practical purity to God. Now, although I believe that all who were present at the Meeting in question would have repudiated the thought of *man's nature in the*

Digitized by Google

abstract being thus reconciled and sanctified, yet, would they, with the same unanimity, have rejected the equally untrue doctrine that individual men were in this way reconciled and sanctified? We cannot, therefore, watch too carefully against any statement that ascribes to a part of Christ's Person that which Scripture ascribes to the whole of His Person.

As regards the rest of the passage, we cannot but regard it as pregnant with error. When the Scripture speaks of the blood of Christ, it means the blood which He shed and offered unto God atoningly on the Cross. That blood having been accepted as soon as the oblation on the Cross was completed, did instantly secure to all believers freedom from the imputation of the defilement of sin, and freedom from the dominion or mastership of sin; but it does not free the believer from the presence and inroads of sin. That which frees from the curse and from the mastership of sin, and secures perpetuated acceptance for the person of the believer, is Christ's atoning *death*. That which curbs and restrains the practical workings of sin in him is Christ's Spirit strengthening "the new man," which, by the quickening power of the Spirit, has been in all the regenerated "created." That which fully frees from the presence and defiling influences of sin, and practically qualifies for life in Heaven, is Christ's power in the day of His return in glory, when "corruption shall put on incorruption," and "the image of the earthy" shall give place "to the image

Digitized by Google

of the heavenly." All these blessings are secured in the covenant of grace, and will therefore all be accomplished in due season, although the time, order, and instrumentality of their ministration are various. But in the passage before us, these and other like distinctions are ignored. The author speaks of Christ's *blood* as if synonymous with *life* (ζωη), whereas the Scripture speaks of it as the witness of Christ's *death*. The author speaks of Christ's blood being "diffused as *life* all over and through the soul." The Scripture has not such a thought as Christ's blood being diffused as life, or in any other way, "all over and through the soul." God is pleased to ascribe to us the value of the atoning blood "once" on the Cross offered to Him. He is pleased in the riches of His grace to ascribe the value of Christ's blood to us the moment we believe, but He does not infuse it into us as life, or in any other way. There is no such thing as actual *impartation* or *infusion* of the blood sacramentally, or in any other way. The moment God is pleased to view us under the imputed value of the blood, *we* (to use typical language) are "sprinkled," and the moment our consciences duly apprehend that God does attribute the value of the blood to us our *consciences* are purged. The comfortable apprehension of this may cause joy and peace to be diffused throughout our souls; but this is something very different from the blood of Christ as "life being diffused all over and through the soul." The Scripture does indeed speak of life being in us through the quickening

Digitized by Google

power of the Spirit, whereby "the new man" is created in us; but it does not speak even of this life being "diffused all over and through the soul." If there were such a diffusion of the life of Christ "*all over and through the soul,*" a condition of practical perfectness would certainly be attained by us here so high that no higher condition could, by any system of "perfectionism," be devised. And yet the author of the paper in question did not wish to teach the doctrine of perfectionism. He was carried away by a current of wrong thought, and had drifted into the position he occupied unawares. He had too implicitly confided in the guidance of another. Errors of inadvertency, however, are not guiltless, nor are they the less disastrous in their consequences because they have been fallen into inadvertently by those who propagate them.

Nothing can justify the statement that "the soul is purged from defilement by having Christ's life diffused all over it and through it." The soul, indeed, or (to speak more correctly) the person of the believer, is purged *from the imputation* of all defilement by the application to him by God of the atoning value of the blood once offered on the Cross; but to say that "the soul is purged from defilement by Christ's life being diffused all over it," is altogether untrue. If it were true, no indwelling sin could remain in the believer. We should already have the practical perfectness of heaven. But the greatness of the error is enhanced by

Digitized by Google

"the life" so diffused being regarded as the application of the blood of atonement, so that no one can be regarded as duly sprinkled with the blood whose soul is not purged from defilement by the blood *as life* being diffused all over it and through it. Such a confusion between the sprinkling of the blood of atonement by God on the person of a believer (whence results his everlasting acceptance in all the acceptableness of Christ)—confusion between this and the creation of "the new man" in the believer by the quickening power of the Spirit, is error of the gravest kind. And what would be the consequences of this error as respects others? Suppose we were to say to a trembling believer, burdened with the sense of indwelling sin, that he had not been sprinkled with the blood of the Lamb, for if he had been, his soul would have been purged from defilement by Christ's "life being diffused all over it and through it"—should we not drive him to despair? Would he not say, and rightly say, "If no one is sprinkled by God with the blood of atonement except one whose soul is purged from defilement by Christ's life diffused all over it and through it, I certainly am not sprinkled; and seeing that none but the sprinkled are pardoned, I must be unpardoned." Such, doubtless, would be his reasoning; and his conclusion would be just: but what would be the responsibility resting upon us for having led him to this false conclusion?

The testimony of the Word of God is far different

Digitized by Google

from this. It teaches us that all the family of faith, whether weak as Nicodemus, or whether strong as Mary and as John, were avowedly placed by God under the full efficacy of the atoning blood of Jesus, as soon as His one oblation was, on the Cross, offered and accepted. As soon as the vail of the Temple was rent, the new and living way into the holiest of all was avowedly opened to all believers. The moment God viewed them as standing under the value of the blood, they were all (to use typical language) "*sprinkled.*" It is the prerogative of God to impute the value of the blood of atonement to His people; and as soon as He views them as standing under its efficacy they are said to be "*sprinkled.*" The relation which He had held towards them as men (a relation founded on the transgression of "the first man") was one of "judgment unto condemnation." Rom. v. 18. But by the obedience of the Second Man (an obedience extending through death) a new ground of action was supplied, whereon God founded His economy of grace. His relation to all who come to Him on that new ground is no longer one of judgment unto condemnation and eternal death. On the contrary, it is one of grace—grace reigning "through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. v. 21.

The great, primary, fundamental change effected for all believers by the atonement finished on the Cross, is a change in the governmental relation in which God

Digitized by Google

stands to them, so that their relation becomes one of grace and abiding favour, and is no longer one of wrath. They are translated from one kingdom into another kingdom—a kingdom founded on redemption. And they are under a new testamentary covenant—a covenant of unchanging grace, founded on the blood of Jesus. "This cup is the new Testament in my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. xxvi. 28. The symbolic cup was a sign and a pledge that all who received, through faith in the blood of Jesus, remission of sins, should also inherit every other blessing which the New Covenant of grace was appointed to bring. Necessarily, therefore, all believers, as soon as they are recognised by God as standing under the blood of atonement, are recognised as "sprinkled;" otherwise He could not say unto them, "Your sins and iniquities I will remember no more." Christ having effected the cleansement of their sins (*καθαρισμον των ἁμαρτιων ποιησαμενος*. Heb. i. 3), did thereby secure to them a cleanness which is complete, and which none can take from them. As they have a title to stand in the judicial Courts of God "uncharged" (*ανεγκλητοι*), so they have a title to stand in the Courts of His worship—His Temple-Courts, as "washed" (*λελουμενοι*); "cleansed" (*κεκαθαρισμενοι*); and "sanctified" (*ἡγιασμενοι*). This cleanness being the *non-imputation* of their defilement by a covenant act of God, founded on a finished atonement, is a cleanness that attaches inseparably and abidingly to their

Digitized by Google

persons, even while they yet remain in the flesh,* and results, as soon as the hour of resurrection comes, in their being brought by an act of Christ's glorious power, into a conformity to His likeness in glory. The intercession of their great High Priest for them within the vail (whereby the dignity and holiness of the Divine government is upheld, and vindicated against the accusations of the Accuser) is based upon the plea that they *have been*, by the efficacy of the offering, once made on the Cross, abidingly cleansed.

Every believer that truly walks in the Spirit, has as he advances, a deep and daily-increasing *consciousness* of sin; that is to say, he is conscious that sin dwells within him, and that in many things he fails; and this he habitually confesses, otherwise he would not be walking *righteously*, that is to say, in conformity with the will of God. But although he is thus *conscious* of sin, yet he has a title to say that he has no longer "*conscience*" thereof; that is to say, his conscience having been taught to recognise the efficacy of the blood of Jesus once offered, is

* We are "preserved" (τετηρημενοι) in Jesus Christ as well as "called." See Jude 1. "Already" (ηδη), says our Lord, "are ye clean, because of the word (δια τον λογον) which I have spoken unto you." He refers to that word which had guided their souls in faith to Him as the Lamb of God. Elsewhere He says, "He that hath been bathed (ὁ λελουμενος) needeth not to wash (νιψασθαι) save his feet, but is clean every whit." See this subject further considered in a Tract entitled "Jesus washing His Disciples' Feet," as advertised at end.

Digitized by Google

freed for ever from the apprehension of the guilt of his sin being charged upon him. The worshipper once purged has "no more *conscience* of sins." Heb. x. 2. We must, however, remember that a cleansed person is one thing, a cleansed person with a *consciously* cleansed conscience is another. Every believer has a title to say that his conscience is purged from dead works to serve the living God; in other words, he has a title to say that for Christ's sake none of the defilements arising from his own works (which are as corpses having the savour of death in them) is imputed to him, and that, consequently, he may draw nigh to God in peace and serve Him. Every believer has a title to say this; yet no Nicodemus, whilst he lingers in the Sanhedrim, and none who like the Corinthians dally with worldliness and defilement, and no believers who are uninstructed in the Truth or entangled with false doctrines will, with *consciously* purged and peaceful consciences, serve God. There are at this moment multitudes of true believers who, though they have a title to serve God in peace, have, through ignorance of God's grace or for other reasons, *consciences* not duly purged. "Perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love." Christ, by His own finished work on the Cross, brings unto the believer cleanness; but it is the work of the Holy Ghost to spread abroad in the heart such knowledge of Christ's work, and love, and faithful grace, as to cause the soul to apprehend

Digitized by Google

and appreciate its portion. It is the work of the Holy Ghost also to give increase of grace so as to enable the soul to keep *practically* near to Christ, learning of Him, eschewing the things that He eschewed, and growing in the apprehension of His glory, and the glory that we are to inherit with Him and under Him. Such apprehension Satan, aided often by our own rashness, wilfulness, or carelessness, seeks to hinder, and often succeeds. A film comes over our inward eye: faith becomes enfeebled: and so the conscience burdened. There were some to whom (although believers) Christ had reason to say, "I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see." When the eyesalve is thus needed, Christ and His work will be but feebly discerned; but where Christ does dwell in the heart through faith, where our faith truly recognises what He has done, and what He is, we shall be greatly strengthened. The knowledge of the preciousness and abiding efficacy of the oblation once made on the Cross (when such knowledge is duly maintained in the heart through the Spirit) will have a marvellous power in enabling the soul to resist its own corruptions and every other form of evil: but a soul that has to resist defiling influences within itself, and is strengthened by the knowledge of the blood once offered on the

Digitized by Google

Cross in doing so (and such is the condition of a soul that has learned to walk with God) would start back affrighted from a voice that should tell it, that "it should be purged from defilement from having Christ's blood or life diffused all over it and through it." It would say, "I have not so learned Christ."

When there is, through faith, an apprehension of the love of God shed abroad in our hearts through the Spirit, or when there is an apprehension of the preciousness of the blood wherewith we are sprinkled, or an apprehension enlarged and steadfast of the glory of Christ, such apprehension will have a marvellous effect in raising us above the power of our own corruptions and all earthly things, and will, as the Apostle says, morally transform us in our thoughts, character, and ways. See 2 Cor. iii. 18. We should, indeed, earnestly pray for an increased supply of the Spirit, that through increase of faith and grace there might be an increase of this transforming power. But even if our experience was like to that of the Apostle in these things (which it is not), yet even then we should not use the language to which I have above referred. We should not speak of the souls of those who are sprinkled by the blood of Jesus being "purged from defilement by having His life diffused all over it, and through it."

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

AN EFFECT

OF

The Doctrines Animadverted on in Preceding Tracts.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

LONDON:

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,
12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.1.

1884.

Digitized by Google

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WERTHEIMER, LEA AND CO.,
CIRCUS PLACE, LONDON WALL.

Digitized by Google

AN EFFECT OF THE DOCTRINES,

ETC.

MY attention was first called to the subject considered in the preceding Tracts by a pamphlet sent me by a clergyman, and addressed to his Diocesan. As his name is not appended, I will not reveal it. When I read the first part of the pamphlet, I hoped to be able to say that I accorded with it all. But I have been utterly disappointed. The pamphlet, as a whole, has intensely pained me. It is, however, worthy of our consideration, as showing the tendency of the system we have been considering. It shows very plainly the conclusion some minds draw (and not unjustly) from Fairbairn's premises.

In the commencement of this pamphlet the Author justly contends that not only Romanist, but Protestant writers also, are greatly to be condemned for the manner in which they evade and virtually set aside the words of the Apostle in Heb. x. 18: "NOW WHERE REMISSION OF THESE IS, THERE REMAINS NO MORE OFFERING FOR

Digitized by Google

SIN." If this Canon of St. Paul's, says the Author, "is not to be taken in the absolute sense of its expressions, who is to assign the limitations with which it admits of being understood?"

Nothing, indeed, can be more certain than that the words of the Apostle authoritatively declare that the guilt of the sins of all believers is so completely removed by the one oblation once made, that no further offering of any kind whatsoever (whether commemorative or repetitive) can be offered *for that object*, either in earth or in heaven. To attempt to remove, in any way, that which God declares to have been, by Christ's finished work, *already* removed, is an act of virtual rebellion. It is a rejection of the value of the one oblation, and a despising God's testimony respecting it. If this statement of the Apostle be not in the strictest sense true, we must be left to perish in our sins; for most certainly nothing less perfect than an oblation such as that which Christ offered when He offered up Himself, could remove the guilt, even of the least sin; and inasmuch as that sacrifice cannot be repeated, we must (if it had not brought to us "everlasting reconciliation") be left without any sacrifice capable of procuring reconciliation. Even if we could offer an "unbloody" offering, it would not avail, for "*without shedding* of blood is no remission."

All this the Author accepts. He quotes with

Digitized by Google

approval the words of Dean Jackson, who truly says: "If both the value of the sacrifice is truly "infinite, and the virtue of it everlasting, without "interruption or discontinuation, the often 'offer-"ing' of the sacrifice, *after what manner so ever*, "is superfluous and blasphemous."

The Author forcibly denounces the thought of any repetition or continuation of our Lord's oblation of Himself, either in earth or in heaven. He says:

"Supposing it [the oblation] continued, this sacrifice has not, then, hitherto attained its object. Remission of these is *not*, and there remaineth offering for sins for the purpose of procuring it. The whole idea is one derogatory to the sufficiency and completeness of Christ's sacrifice. There 'remaineth no more offering for sins,' because remission of these IS, because everything that sacrifice and offering was requisite to do for us has been effected by our Saviour's One oblation of Himself once offered."

"Bellarmine, indeed, finds an argument for offering for sins, under the dispensation of the Gospel in the very terms of the Apostolic Canon by which it is proscribed. Where remission of these *is* (he says) 'there remaineth no more offering for sins'; where, then, this remission is not, there, there remaineth offering for sins still. And as there is no perfect remission of sins hitherto, as 'Forgive us our trespasses' is a prayer daily appropriate to Christians at this moment, it follows that there is still an 'offering for sins' requisite to procure for us the remission we still want. This argument, ludicrously as it reads, embodies too much of the spirit of our modern Protestantism. The Apostle's Canon is evaded, and evaded in exactly the same way both

Digitized by Google

by Papist and by Protestant. 'Offering for sins' remains according to the system of the Protestant as well as of the Papist, and remains for the same reason; namely to cause that remission of sins to be, which the Apostle says already *is*. The old and the new covenants are confounded. The gospel disappears, and God is presented before us again in the aspects of the law."

These observations are valuable, and are, as respects *some* Protestants, true. But the doctrines of Protestantism as taught in its authorized Confessions are (as sad experience teaches us) not always accepted by those who bear the name of Protestant. As regards Bellarmine, however, there can be no question that his statements are in strict harmony with the Creed of Rome. Bellarmine's system requires for its acceptance the annihilation of Hebrews ix. and x. It cannot stand for a moment by the side of those two chapters. Neither Cardinal Bellarmine, nor any one else who maintains in any sense whatsoever the repetition of offering for sin, can admit what the Scripture teaches; for it teaches that the oblation, once offered, brings those who are under it (that is, all believers) into a relation radically, essentially, and abidingly, different from that in which they before stood. *Before*, they stood in the presence of God's unpropitiated holiness, with all their criminality resting upon their heads—exposed, consequently, to that fulness of wrath which must be the portion of those who remain

Digitized by Google

under a covenant of law, and are not brought under a covenant of grace. But the moment we are brought, through faith, under the efficacy of the one oblation, our governmental relation to God is changed, and changed for ever. We exchange the headship of the First Adam for the headship of the Second Man. We quit Sinai, and stand before Zion; not, however, without the claims of Sinai having been fully met for us by our Substitute—met by His having presented sacrificially His own perfectness, and by His having borne the appointed penalties, whereby the ascription of criminality gives place to ascription of our Substitute's meritoriousness, so that the *normal* governmental relation of God to us becomes one of favour according to the meritoriousness of our Substitute, and is no longer one of wrath according to the criminality of our sin. And this new relation is held under a covenant—and that covenant a covenant of grace —and that grace founded on the perpetuity of the SATISFACTION made to all the claims of God's holiness by the one oblation. To stand, therefore, as children in the presence of a reconciled Father, and to say (as we continually should say) "forgive us our trespasses," is a very different thing from standing as unpardoned rebels in the presence of the unappeased wrath of Sinai. Christ, in interceding for His believing people, is, by the rules of God's Courts, empowered to assume, and always

Digitized by Google

does assume, the perfectness and perpetuity of the reconciliation and favour into which His one oblation has brought them. Whatever forgiveness, whatever blessing He asks for them, He asks on the ground of their having been once and for ever brought in reconciliation and favour unto God as a Father, *through the offering once made*, and under the applied efficacy whereof they, by covenant-title, stand, so that there is never, *in any sense*, a repetition of the offering, or a repetition of the reconciliation into which that offering has, in perpetuity, brought them. These things Bellarmine, and they who follow Rome, must, of course, by the necessity of their position, deny. They cannot be expected to receive that which would lay the whole fabric of their sacerdotal system in ruins. Yet, surely, Protestants should have guarded this truth as the apple of their eye. Yet they have not. The following remarks of the Author on this subject are severe, and as respects evangelical Protestants far too unlimited in their scope: yet they convey a needed warning—a warning that ought not to be despised.

"The real question is at bottom: — Is the Apostolic Çanon, that 'where remission of these is, there is *no more* offering for sins,' to be taken in the plain and obvious meaning of its terms, or is it not? Because if it is, *all* 'offering for sins' is over in this case, whether in heaven or on earth; and while 'the Sacrifice of the Altar' is to be condemned as the superstition (a superstition opposed to all

Digitized by Google

the more distinctive and precious principles of Christian truth) which Protestants have been in the habit of alleging it to be, at the same time the doctrine of our Lord, as continuously offering in heaven in His work of intercession, is a doctrine equally to be repudiated, as equally contravening St. Paul's Canon, equally at variance with the truth, that 'remission of sins IS,' equally conflicting with the first principles of Christianity, and even more dishonouring to Christ and more derogatory to the claims of His 'one oblation once offered' to be confided in as finished, efficacious, and complete. If St. Paul's Canon, on the contrary, is not to be taken in the absolute sense of its expressions, who is to assign the limitations with which it admits of being understood? Who, as long as Christ is not 'crucified afresh,' is to pronounce what 'offering for sins' may not admissibly go on, in consistency with a Canon so peremptory and rigid in its terms, but so elastic in reality. In consistency with it we have our Saviour 'offering for sins' in heaven, and why not His ministers offering similarly—of course subordinately—in the Church on earth? Bellarmine, with more reason and consistency than his opponents, regards the Canon as excluding only 'offerings of blood.' Dr. ——— takes it as excluding any offering for sin involving the ideas of 'immolation and a victim.' Field, on the contrary (Of the Church, b. iii., Appendix), considers these ideas as very tolerable. All agree that 'offering for sins' is abundantly consistent with the terms of the Canon in some sense; and all, that the offering for sins which is admissible is not one which is reiterative of the sacrifice of Christ, but one simply commemorative of this sacrifice, representing it and applicatory of its benefits. The Protestant affirms a commemorative offering, the Papist and the Ritualist advocate no other. About what, then, are they quarrelling? It is no doubt true that the Papists and the Ritualists believe that God is to be propitiated by this 'offering,' but this also,

Digitized by Google

instead of being denied, is, on the contrary, affirmed in common with them, by, at once, the sturdiest and most typical of all Protestants [Dr. ———]. And what then is the difference?* Putting the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or quasi-Transubstantiation, out of the question, it would be difficult to say; but quite easy, on the contrary, to show that Papists and Protestants, Ritualists and anti-Ritualists, are in a maze of theological error and mistake together; that Scripture is misunderstood and misinterpreted by both alike; that the fundamental principle of both is an entirely mistaken one; that, if true, it would carry us farther in the direction of offering for sin than the wildest Romanism has ever thought of going, and that, false as it is, it convicts not only Romanists and Ritualists, but Protestants and Evangelicals, of a Christianity subversive of all that is most precious in the revelation of the Gospel."

I trust that the writer just referred to (whose letter is not given) may have been misunderstood, and that he may be exempted from these strictures. I regret, however, to say that the third who is referred to in the concluding part of the extract just made, cannot be exempted. When I first read the charge made by the Author of this

* If God had commanded us to immolate a victim (which He has not done) the object would have been attestation to the value of the oblation once made on the Cross, whereby reconciliation has been secured, and that for ever. The Eucharist is not a sacrifice: but if it had been, its object would have been neither the attainment nor the restitution of reconciliation, but the bringing to remembrance that one finished offering whereby reconciliation had been in perpetuity secured.

Digitized by Google

pamphlet, I thought he must have misapprehended the writer's meaning. But he has not. The words of Dr. ——— as quoted by the Author in a note are: "It will be said, Do you then deny that the "service of the Eucharist is in any sense *pro-* "*pitiatory* in behalf of the Church? . . . I "would observe that it is strictly true, in a sense "that a real sacrifice of the Cross, the true "body and blood of Christ, are offered up in the "Eucharist—nay, more, that remission of sins can "only be obtained by the offering up of the true "sacrifice of the Cross."

It cannot be denied that the words of Dr. ——— (which are correctly quoted) are to be greatly deplored; and the sentiments they express must be unequivocally condemned. Yet Dr. ——— was a Protestant standard-bearer. A standard-bearer may yield to misguiding influences, and may stumble or fall, and yet not abandon his colours, or join the banner of the foe. I believe Dr. ——— prized in his heart, and honestly desired to uphold, the doctrines taught in the first eighteen Articles of the Church of England. I cannot, therefore, class him with Papists, Ritualists, or any other persons who hate those Articles, and desire to trample them to the dust. One cause of the aberration of Dr. ——— I believe to have been his profound acquaintance with the Patristic writings. I have never seen any one who has been much occupied with these writings, who

Digitized by Google

has not imbibed, more or less, of their deadly poison.

I do not, however, wish to palliate wrong statements, or to blind myself to the disastrous consequences that have resulted to Protestantism from its want of close, rigid adherence to the Word of God. I believe with the Author, that Protestants have greatly sinned in evading, as they have too commonly done, the force of the Apostolic Canon in Heb. x.: "THERE IS NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN." I unite with him in saying, that every sacrifice presented on the altar was, *ipso facto*, an offering of sweet savour, and that such offering was essential to atonement. I believe with him that Protestants have grievously erred in saying that Christ in His continuous work of priestly intercession is to be regarded as if "offering for sins," or in any sense repeating His sacrifice. Thus far I accord with his statements; but here, I regret to say, our agreement ends. As to all that follows, our sentiments are pole from pole asunder.

In page 8 of his pamphlet we find the Author saying:

"It is an entire, though a prevalent and all but universal misconception, to think of the Mosaic atonements as made by the blood shed: they were made by the blood *sprinkled* after being shed. To 'offer' (every one knows) was the peculiar and inalienable function of the priest, and the business of the priest in connection with the sacrifice did not

Digitized by Google

begin at the same time till the victim had been slain. 'The oblation,' says Outram, 'which *followed* the slaughter of the victim made the business of the priest' (b. ii. c. 7). And so Lightfoot: 'Whoever killed or flayed, the priests ever sprinkled the blood, and none else might do it (vol. ix. p. 73); agreeably with that account which we have of the functions of the priests (Ezek. xliv. 15): 'They shall stand before Me to offer unto Me the fat and the blood, saith the Lord.' Any one might kill. To 'offer' was a distinct thing altogether, and constituted the peculiar function of the priest, consisting in the presentation of the blood and fat immediately to God, after the victim had been slain—the blood (on occasion of the annual solemnities of the Day of Expiation) in the Holy of Holies, or within the vail. This principle, though so long since affirmed by such authorities as Lightfoot and Outram, is one, notwithstanding, which has too generally been ignored, and continues to be so to this moment. It is now, however, generally recognised by writers of at least typological authority. Dr. Fairbairn, for instance, considers that 'the objection of Sykes and Priestley and others (that if the guilt of the offerer was laid upon the victim, men must have offered to God what was polluted) is rather evaded than satisfactorily answered by Magee,' and finds the solution of it in the distinction to be drawn between the blood *shed* and the blood *sprinkled*. It was not offered in being shed, but in being sprinkled, and as sprinkled it was the symbol of resurrection-life—a life that now was 'without sin.'" (Typology, vol. ii. pp. 297-8).

In another page (p. 17) the Author says,

"The atonement is not made by the blood shed (as the blood of guilty, condemned life), but made by the blood sprinkled within the vail (as the blood of justified, righteous, resurrection-life)."

Digitized by Google

In these extracts we find another example of the effects produced by Dr. Fairbairn's "Typology." As regards the first extract a mere reference to two verses in Leviticus xvi. is sufficient to decide the question. The author affirms that the action of the Priest in connexion with the sacrifice did not commence until the sacrifice had been slain; whereas in Leviticus xvi. 11, we read, "And Aaron "shall bring the bullock of the sin-offering which "is for himself, and shall make an atonement for "himself, and for his house, and *shall kill the bullock* "*of the sin-offering which is for himself:*" and again in verse 15 of the same chapter: "He "[Aaron] *shall kill the goat of the sin-offering that* "*is for the people.*" Have these writers never read these words, or do they reject them? We must abandon Leviticus if we follow them.

Aaron on the Day of Atonement had first *to present before the Lord* the victims appointed for the sin-offerings and burnt-offering; afterwards *to slay them;* afterward *to scatter* [זָרַק, see Lev. i.] of the blood on the altar of burnt-offering, and *to pour some* at the bottom of the altar before he sprinkled it [נָזַה] at all. So far from the action of the Priest on the Day of Atonement beginning with the "sprinkling," it began with the "offering," and ended with the "sprinkling:" for it was necessary that the claims of Jehovah should be satisfied first by the offering of the blood to Him before there could be any "sprinkling" on the

Digitized by Google

things or persons that were to be cleansed or hallowed. The chief work of the Priest on the Day of Atonement was that which he performed *towards God*, viz.: the shedding the blood and the presentation thereof by "scattering" and by burning on the altar. "I have given it [the blood] to you *on the altar* to make an atonement for your souls." But all this the system of these writers ignores. They would have "reconciliation" made by *sprinkling*, to the exclusion of atonement made to God *by the shedding of blood.* They take from the blood "shed" and "scattered on the altar" the place that God has assigned to it in making atonement.*

But there is also another question of infinite importance. Why do these writers thus distinguish between the blood of the Holy One "shed," and the blood of the Holy One "offered" and "sprinkled"? The reason is this: they imagine that His blood when shed was contaminated by the sin which He bore for the sake of others; so that it became unclean and polluted, and therefore not in a condition to be offered.

---

* Even as regards the Levitical types, the statement of these writers is wrong. But, if it were otherwise, we have to remember that we are taught in many cases in the New Testament to draw not parallels, but contrasts between the typical and the anti-typical High Priest. This is a subject to which on some future occasion I hope to recur.

Digitized by Google

The author says, p. 17,

"The Atonement is not made by the blood shed (as the blood of guilty condemned life), but made by the blood sprinkled within the vail (as the blood of justified, righteous, resurrection-life)."

And Dr. Fairbairn says:

"It was not offered in being shed, but in being sprinkled, and as sprinkled it was the symbol of resurrection-life—a life that now was without sin."

It would be difficult to find two passages that, in so short a space, announced such an amount of dangerous error. When, at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, we take the cup into our hands, do we believe that the "SHED" blood therein symbolized was the blood "of guilty, condemned life"? Do we not recognise it as the blood of Immanuel —God manifest in the flesh?—pure therefore and holy? "This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." These words are of themselves sufficient; and with them the testimony of the whole of Scripture accords. The blood of the Lord Jesus was a part of His Person; and therefore, if His blood was not holy and unpolluted, His Person could not have been holy and unpolluted (αμιαντος)—which we know it was. (See Heb. vii.) We know that both in life and *in death* He was the Lamb "without blemish." Moreover, if the sin that He bore had in any sense tainted His person, no atonement could have been made on the Cross; for it was on the Cross

Digitized by Google

that the blood was "*shed.*" There, and there only, was He the Holocaust—the whole burnt-offering. "He gave Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." This He did *in death,* and it was necessary to atonement; but he could not have done this in death if His life or blood had been in any sense polluted. Consequently, there could have been no atonement. Nor do we find blood spoken of as the blood of *a life,* but as the blood of *a Person.* Nor do we read of a *justified life:* justification belongs to *persons.* Nor as to any *essential* properties was the humanity of the Lord different after His resurrection from that which it was before: for He rose with the same body in which He died. The life which He laid down, *that same life* (ψυχην) He took again. "Therefore doth my "Father love me, because I lay down my life, "[ψυχην, נֶפֶשׁ,] [the life that He had as man] that "I might take IT again. No one taketh it from me, "but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay "IT down, and I have power to take IT again. "This commandment have I received of my "Father." If the life of the great Substitute had been in any sense tainted, how could the Apostle have said, "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself [and therefore His blood] without blemish to God, cleanse your consciences," &c.? Was not that offering "of Himself once," so often spoken

Digitized by Google

of throughout Hebrews ix. and x., His offering on the Cross? If so, is not He who made it, said to have been "without blemish" *at the time when He made it?* "Without blemish and undefiled," are the words of the Apostle.*

---

* Great pains are taken in the Scripture to show that the blood of the Great Sin-bearer was pure, holy, and undefiled, both before and after it was shed. Thus in the law of the cleansing of the leper—a bird alive and CLEAN was taken, and its blood shed over running water—a type of Immanuel *as man* laying down His holy life: for the bird was, at the time of its being slain, "*clean.*" He became man that He might be capable of death: but He was not only man. "No [mere] man can redeem his brother or give unto God a ransom for him." He was the Eternal Son—One who could say, "Before Abraham was I AM." "Destroy this Temple and in three days I will raise it up." "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Now, although it is true that His Divine Nature could not die, yet He brought the efficacy of all that He was as God not only into His living service, but also into His death. Accordingly, the second typical bird, although not like its fellow slain, was plunged beneath the mingled blood and water, and then liberated. Although not slain, it was brought into as near association with death as was possible without actually dying, and so typically imparted the efficacy of its death into the blood and water into which it had been plunged. Accordingly, although Jesus died *as man,* yet the efficaciousness of what He was as God was imparted unto His death. His death was not the death of a mere man. It was the death of One who was God as well as man. "Feed the Church of God which

Digitized by Google

The Author, of course, clearly sees that if the blood of the Holy Substitute became "polluted" by imputation, and so continued until He died—if the blood He shed was "the blood of guilty, condemned life," then He could have made no atonement on earth, because there could be no atonement where there is no sacrifice "of sweet savour." Accordingly, following Socinus, who argued similarly, the Author affirms that Atonement was not effected by the Lord *on earth*, but that He effected it after He entered Heaven—a statement which is at once utterly quenched by the words "received up in glory" (εν δοξῃ), for how could the Lord have been "received up *in glory*" if He ascended before the work of Atonement had been accomplished? Moreover, it was necessary for the effectuation of Atonement that the Holocaust or Burnt-offering should be burned for fragrance (הִקְטִיר, see Lev. i. 9) on the Burnt-offering altar, and that its blood should be "scattered" for acceptance (זָרַק) on the altar, and that the fat and other parts of the Sin-offering also, should be burned for fragrance (הִקְטִיר) on the altar (see Lev. xvi. 25). Now, in heaven there is no Burnt-offering altar,

---

He purchased by *His own blood.*" [If we adopt the more ancient reading Κυριου, the force of the statement is by no means lessened, for εκκλησια Κυριου would answer to the Hebrew קְהַל יְהוָה, Church, or Congregation, of Jehovah. For further remarks on the subject, see Bishop Pearson on Creed.

Digitized by Google

nor anything answering thereunto. The place of the Burnt-offering altar is earth. Its place was not within the vail, but in the outer court of the Tabernacle, external to the Sanctuary (*ναος*). Nor is this all. For the effectuation of Atonement it was necessary that the Sin-offering also should be offered. But the Sin-offering, as a whole, could not be burned on the altar for a sweet savour as the Burnt-offering was. Part of it was appointed to be "*burned up*" (שָׂרַף) in devouring fire "without the camp." There can be no such "*burning up*" in heaven. There is no place "without the camp" there. The consuming fire of wrath burns not there. Earth, not heaven, was the sphere where all these things were accomplished.

Nor could the two burnings of the Sin-offering, respectively indicated by שָׂרַף and קָטַר, be so separated as for the one to be in Heaven, and the other on earth.

There it was that our iniquities and their consequences were "caused to fall" (like a mighty crushing weight) on our holy Substitute. "It "pleased Jehovah to bruise Him and to put Him "to grief, and to make His soul an offering for "sin." "By *His stripes* we are healed." "He "bore our sins in His own body on the tree." There is no such bearing of sin in heaven. There are no "stripes," no "bruising," no "putting to grief" there. All this was accomplished on earth; and if it had not been so accomplished, there

Digitized by Google

could have been no atonement, and consequently no salvation.

The first of these arguments respecting the place of the Burnt-offering altar being earth—not heaven, the Author (as far as I can find) passes over unnoticed. The last he meets by boldly avowing his belief that the doctrine of penal vicarious suffering is untrue; and he complains both of Outram and of Fairbairn, that they do not follow out their premises and boldly advance to the conclusion which these premises necessarily involve.

In another pamphlet (published subsequently to that which I have been quoting, and entitled "Anselm, Scriptural and Catholic") the Author says:

"God was not propitiated because Christ vicariously *suffered* for our sins, but because we, under the condemnation of those sins, were rendered acceptable and accepted freely through His righteousness." (P. 8.)

"The element of Atonement, according to his [Anselm's] scheme, was in no degree furnished by vicariousness of suffering, but wholly and altogether by vicariousness of righteousness." (P. 8.)

And again:

"It may be confidently affirmed that such a conception as that of Atonement by vicariousness of suffering, never presented itself to his [Anselm's] mind, except as one which all persons would immediately reject in the view of its palpable absurdity and the injury to the Divine attributes involved in its idea." (P. 9.)*

---

* The Author adduces not a particle of evidence that

Digitized by Google

In another pamphlet, entitled "Propitiatory Sacrifice," the Author says, p. 7:

"It is thus untrue that expiatory sacrifice is either, first, in the formal idea of its *vicarious*, or, secondly, at all penal in idea. [Here we find it stated that Christ's expiatory sacrifice is neither vicarious nor penal.] It is, on the contrary, the worshipper presenting God with his own life; and this not as sacrificial in punishment for his sin, but as offered to redeem him from the punishment which he is sensible of meriting."

When I find in the Scripture such words as these: "I am poured out like water, and all my "bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax; "it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My "strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my "tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and THOU hast "brought me into the dust of death"; and again when I read in Isaiah liii., "He was wounded for "our transgressions, was bruised for our iniquities: "the chastisement of our peace was upon Him: "and with His stripes we are healed. All we like "sheep have gone astray; we have turned every "one to his own way; and Jehovah laid on Him

---

proves this. No doubt, in "*Cur Deus homo*," Anselm dwells too exclusively on the thought of satisfaction to God rendered by the obedience of the Holy One, and does not sufficiently show that that obedience included the endurance of veritable wrath in the stead of His people; but this does not prove that Anselm had fallen into the heresy of blotting Isaiah liii. out of the Scriptures.

Digitized by Google

"[caused to light or descend on Him] the iniquity "of us all"; when I read in the New Testament that Christ "was made a curse for us" (Gal. iii. 13); and that He "bore our sins in His own body on the tree"; when I find further, that the words employed by the Holy Ghost to denote Atonement, כִּפֶּר עַל, and ἱλασκομαι, unquestionably indicate the *appeasement of wrath*, I see that, if I accept the doctrine that Christ did not suffer *vicariously* and *penally*, I must reject the Bible, and abandon *Christianity* as therein taught. There can be no Atonement where there is not obedience vicariously rendered, and penalty vicariously borne. Withdraw either of these, and atonement, as declared in the Scripture, ceases to be.

That the Author repudiates the distinctive doctrines both of the Bible and of the Reformation, is therefore too evident. The glare of the deceiving lights kindled by Catholic antiquity have so blinded him, that he utterly fails to distinguish the contrariety of its doctrines to the doctrines of the Apostles of our God and Saviour. Accordingly, he regrets that Hooker should have represented the "differences between the Romanists and ourselves as fundamental and irreconcilable." The Author's words are:

"Hooker himself, indeed, represents those differences between the Romanists and ourselves as fundamental and irreconcilable, which [differences] mutual explanation (according to Dean Field and Richard Baxter) shows to be rather

Digitized by Google

verbal than substantial, or at the worst rather practical than speculative. The circumstances of the times were such as to make the temptation to excess to one extent or another, in the direction opposite to Romanism, all but irresistible. There have been and are attempts made to alter and modify the Formularies. It has often appeared wonderful to me that no one ever has arisen to propose a revision of the Articles. The Formularies are the tradition of catholic antiquity, breathing Scripture and catholicity in every word. The Articles are redolent, on the contrary, of a controversy and a time. The balance of catholic feeling was disturbed, when the Articles were framed, by the conflicts of the day; and the Articles have stereotyped an inclination in which Puritanism within the Church has, at all times, found a plea—a plea that would be tolerable if it would be satisfied with toleration, and was not always aspiring to dominion."

Strange and awful words these from the lips of one who once professed to be an Evangelical Clergyman. He wishes that the Protestantism of the first eighteen Articles of the Anglican Confession (Articles precious beyond all price) should be swept away to make room for Formularies redolent of Popery and death. He maintains that our differences with Rome are "*verbal*" not "*substantial*." Semi-Socinian in heart, he is willing to be Romanistic in Ritual and practice. Neologianism, therefore, supplies no real bulwark against Popery, as facts, every day multiplying, abundantly show.

Until the evidence be produced, I decline to believe that Richard Baxter ever said or wrote

Digitized by Google

anything that would imply that he regarded our differences with Rome as other than vital. His whole life showed that he deemed those differences to be *vital.*

Hooker's words, which the Author condemns, are as follows:

"*That grand question*, that hangeth in controversy between us and Rome, is *about the matter of justifying righteousness.* We disagree about *the nature and essence of the medicine whereby Christ cureth our disease;* about *the manner of applying it;* about *the number and the power of means*, which God requireth in us for the effectual applying thereof to our soul's comfort. When they are required to show what the righteousness is whereby a Christian man is justified, they answer that it is a divine spiritual *quality;* which quality received into the soul, doth first make it to be one of them who are born of God; and secondly, endue it with power to bring forth such works as they do that are born of Him; even as the soul of man, being joined to his body, doth first make him to be of the number of reasonable creatures; and, secondly, enable him to perform the natural functions which are proper to his kind: that it maketh the soul amiable and gracious in the sight of God, in regard whereof it is termed Grace; that it purgeth, purifieth and washeth out all stains and pollutions of sins; that, by it, through the merit of Christ, we are delivered, as from sin, so from eternal death and condemnation, the reward of sin. This Grace will have to be applied by infusion; to the end that, as the body is warm by the heat which is in the body, so the soul might be made righteous by inherent Grace; which Grace they make capable of increase; as the body may be more warm, so the soul more and more justified, according as Grace should be

Digitized by Google

augmented; the augmentation whereof is merited by good works, as good works are made meritorious by it. Wherefore, the first receipt of Grace, in their divinity, is the first Justification: the increase thereof, the second Justification. As Grace may be increased by the merit of good works: so it may be diminished by the demerit of sins venial; it may be lost by mortal sin. Inasmuch, therefore, as it is needful, in the one case to repair, in the other to recover, the loss which is made, the infusion of Grace hath her sundry aftermeals: for the which cause, they make many ways to apply the infusion of Grace. It is applied to infants through Baptism, without either faith or works; and, in them, really it taketh away original sin, and the punishment due unto it: it is applied to infidels and wicked men in the first Justification, through Baptism, without works, yet not without faith; and it taketh away sins both actual and original together, with all whatsoever punishment, eternal or temporal, thereby deserved. Unto such as have attained the first Justification, that is to say, this first receipt of Grace,—it is applied farther by good works to the increase of former Grace: which is the second Justification. If they work more and more, Grace doth more increase: and they are more and more justified. To such as diminish it by venial sins, it is applied by holy water, Ave Marias, crossings, papal salutations, and such like: which serve for reparations of Grace decayed. To such as have lost it through mortal sin, it is applied by the Sacrament (as they term it) of Penance: which sacrament hath force to confer Grace anew; yet in such sort, that, being so conferred, it hath not altogether so much power as at the first. For it only cleanseth out the stain or guilt of sin committed: and changeth the punishment eternal into a temporal satisfactory punishment here, if time do serve, if not, hereafter to be endured; except it be lightened by masses, works of charity, pilgrimages, fasts, and such like;

Digitized by Google

or else shortened, by pardon, by term, or by plenary pardon quite removed and taken away. . . . This maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread, when they ask her the way to Justification. Whether they speak of the first or second Justification, they make the essence of a divine quality inherent; they make it righteousness which is in us. If it be in us, then it is ours; as our souls are ours, though we have them from God, and can hold them no longer than pleaseth him; for, if he withdraw the breath of our nostrils, we fall to dust. But the righteousness, wherein we must be found, if we will be justified, is not our own. Therefore we cannot be justified by any inherent quality. The Church of Rome, in teaching Justification by inherent Grace, doth *pervert the truth of Christ:* and, by the hands of the Apostles, we have received otherwise than she teacheth."

The Eleventh Article of our English Confession says:—

"We are accounted righteous before God ONLY for the merit (*propter meritum*) of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith (*per fidem*), and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort; as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."

Compare with the doctrine of this Article, and with the doctrine of Hooker, the following statements:—

"Justification consists in God's *inward* presence." "It is the act of God imparting His Divine presence to the soul, through baptism, and so making us the temples of the Holy Ghost." "It is the habitation in us of God the Father, and the word Incarnate,

Digitized by Google

through the Holy Ghost" (p. 17). "Christ is our righteousness, by dwelling in us by His Spirit; justifies by entering into us; continues to justify by remaining in us" (p. 51). This divine gift, or indwelling, is "an angelic glory which prophets and apostles exult in as the great gift of Divine mercy, as the rich garment of salvation and the enjewelled robe of righteousness; a linen *clean* and *white*" (p. 184). "This is the glorious Shekinah of the Word Incarnate—the true wedding garment in which the soul must be dressed" (p. 220). "This doctrine buries self in the absorbing vision of a present, an indwelling God" (p. 220).*

Holy words, these, by which the figments of Ecclesiasticism have been for eighteen hundred years gilded, and made to deceive into idolatry and eternal death. The Scripture teaches us that the one oblation offered on the Cross does, by the *imputation* of its sweet savour, perfect as to acceptance for ever all those who are under it—that is, all "the household of faith." But the doctrine of these writers nullifies the ONE SACRIFICE whereon exclusively *our title* to salvation and all the results of salvation, both in time and in eternity, rest.

I will yet make one more extract. Gandolphy writes:—

---

* See remarks on these and other statements of Dr. Pusey and Dr. Newman in Bishop McIlvaine's "Oxford Divinity," pp. 72, 73.

Digitized by Google

"As God has chosen men to be His instruments and agents in purifying His creatures from *original* and *actual* sin by the spiritual regeneration of baptism, so has He likewise commissioned men to pardon and restore to grace those who might afterwards relapse. He has instituted for the latter a form of repentance—a tribunal of contrition and penance. If the grace of Baptism be forfeited by sin, the subsequent pardon and renewal, though gratuitous on the part of God, are to be accompanied and secured by the criminal's own humiliation and repentance. Here in the Catholic Church it is called the Sacrament of *Penance*." "No individual can obtain the remission of sins after Baptism without submitting to Penance (Sacrament of Penance) either in effect or desire." "Jesus Christ has instituted the Sacrament of Penance for the ordinary remission of all sin committed after Baptism." (Gandolphy, as quoted by Bishop McIlvaine, p. 247.)

Does the Author indeed desire that we should modify and amend the words of Hooker and of the Articles by formularies (whether ancient or modern) that are redolent of doctrines such as these? I say, "God forbid." There is such a thing as "withdrawal unto perdition." See the warnings at the close of Hebrews x.

Bunyan's writings are professedly valued in this country; but it would be well if certain parts of

Digitized by Google

them were pondered more. The dialogue between Christian and Ignorance, in "Pilgrim's Progress," deserves far more close attention than it commonly receives. It is designed to show (to use Bunyan's words) that "there was a way to Hell even from the gate of Heaven, as well as from the City of Destruction."

IGNORANCE.—Do you think that I am such a fool as to think that God can see no further than I; or that I would come to God in the best of my performances?

CHRISTIAN.—Why, how dost thou think in this matter?

IGNORANCE.—Why, to be short, I think I must believe in Christ for justification.

CHRISTIAN.—How! think thou must believe in Christ, when thou seest not thy need of Him? Thou neither seest thy original nor actual infirmities, but hast such an opinion of thyself, and of what thou doest, as plainly renders thee to be one that did never see a necessity of Christ's personal righteousness to justify thee before God. How then, dost thou say, I believe in Christ?

IGNORANCE.—I believe well enough for all that.

CHRISTIAN.—How dost thou believe?

IGNORANCE.—I believe that Christ died for sinners; and that I shall be justified before God from the curse, through His gracious acceptance of my obedience to His law. Or thus, Christ

Digitized by Google

makes my duties, that are religious, acceptable to His Father by virtue of His merits; and so shall I be justified.

CHRISTIAN.—Let me give an answer to this confession of thy faith.

1. Thou believest with a fantastical faith; for this faith is nowhere described in the word.

2. Thou believest with a false faith; because it taketh justification from the personal righteousness of Christ, and applies it to thy own.

3. This faith maketh not Christ a justifier of thy person, but of thy actions; and of thy person for thy actions' sake, which is false.

4. Therefore this faith is deceitful, even such as will leave thee under wrath in the day of God Almighty: for true justifying faith puts the soul, as sensible of its lost condition by the law, upon flying for refuge unto Christ's righteousness (which righteousness of His is not an act of grace by which He maketh, for justification, thy obedience accepted with God, but His personal obedience to the law, in doing and suffering for us what that required at our hand); this righteousness, I say, true faith accepteth; under the skirt of which the soul being shrouded, and by it presented as spotless before God, it is accepted, and acquitted from condemnation.

IGNORANCE.—What! would you have us trust to what Christ in His own person has done without us? This conceit would loosen the reins of

Digitized by Google

our lust, and tolerate us to live as we list: for what matter how we live, if we may be justified by Christ's personal righteousness from all, when we believe it?

CHRISTIAN.—Ignorance is thy name; and as thy name is, so art thou: even this thy answer demonstrateth what I say. Ignorant thou art of what justifying righteousness is, and as ignorant how to secure thy soul, through the faith of it, from the heavy wrath of God. Yea, thou also art ignorant of the true effects of saving faith in this righteousness of Christ, which is to bow and win over the heart to God in Christ, to love His name, His word, ways, and people, and not as thou ignorantly imaginest.

Modern Teaching, for the most part, sides with Ignorance rather than with Christian. If a Tract or a Sermon speak somewhat of Christ, men care little to inquire whether His work be spoken of according to the manner in which it is declared in Scripture, or otherwise; and yet the Scripture says, "He who leadeth onward (ὁ προαγων), and abideth not in THE DOCTRINE of Christ, hath not God." The Scripture declares Christ to be "Jehovah OUR Righteousness," and also declares what He hath done in order to constitute Himself OUR Righteousness. Weigh well the following passages:—"This is that which shall be unto her [forgiven Jerusalem] proclaimed, Jehovah is our

Digitized by Google

Righteousness."* (Jeremiah xxxiii. 16.) "By the obedience of One shall the many be constituted righteous." (Rom. v. 18.) "By acquaintance with Himself shall the Righteous One, MY SERVANT, bring righteousness unto the many, and their iniquities He shall bear."† (Isaiah liii. 11.) "Not one jot or one tittle shall in any wise pass from the Law till all be fulfilled." As the obedient "servant," He provided for all the household of faith a justifying righteousness. The obedience by which He provided it commenced by His Incarnation and terminated by the completion of His oblation on the Cross. There He was made a curse for them—there also He gave Himself for them as "an offering and sacrifice to God of a sweet-smelling savour." It was a work altogether *external* to ourselves, and on that *external* work, the whole TITLE of our acceptance and blessedness surely, and for ever, rests. Nothing wrought in us, or on us, forms any part of that on which our TITLE to glory is founded. It is found wholly in the IMPUTED Meritoriousness of Another, and in that alone.

The following remarks of Bunyan are peculiar, but substantively true. His is true Protestant theology, and in sorrowful contrast with it stands the semi-patristic, semi-Papist, semi-neologian system

---

* Such is the correct translation.

† בְּדַעְתּוֹ יַצְדִּיק צַדִּיק עַבְדִּי לָרַבִּים וַעֲוֹנֹתָם הוּא יִסְבֹּל׃

Digitized by Google

which professing Protestantism is constructing now, and which Evangelicalism, whether from sloth or ignorance, cares not to resist.

Now I saw in my dream, that they went on, and Great-heart before them. So they went, and came to the place where Christian's burden fell off his back, and tumbled into a sepulchre. Here, then, they made a pause; and here, also, they blessed God. Now, said Christiana, comes to my mind what was said to us at the gate, to wit, that we should have pardon by word and deed: by word, that is, by the promise; by deed, to wit, in the way it was obtained. What the promise is, of that I know something; but what it is to have pardon by deed, or in the way that it was obtained, Mr. Great-heart, I suppose you know; therefore, if you please, let us hear you discourse thereof.

GREAT.—Pardon by the deed done, is pardon obtained by some one for another that hath need thereof; not by the person pardoned, but in the way, saith another, in which I have obtained it. So, then, to speak to the question more at large, the pardon that you, and Mercy, and these boys have attained, was obtained by another; to wit, by Him that let you in at that gate. And He hath obtained it in this double way; He hath performed righteousness to cover you,—and spilt His blood to wash you in.

Digitized by Google

CHRISTIANA.—But if He parts with His righteousness to us, what will He have for Himself?

GREAT.—He has more righteousness than you have need of, or than He needeth Himself.

CHRISTIANA.—Pray make that appear.

GREAT.—With all my heart. But first I must premise, that He, of whom we are now about to speak, is one that has not His fellow. He had two natures in one person, plain to be distinguished, impossible to be divided. Unto each of these natures a righteousness belongeth, and each righteousness is essential to that nature; so that one may as easily cause the nature to be extinct, as to separate its justice or righteousness from it. Of these righteousnesses, therefore, we are not made partakers, so as that they, or any of them, should be put upon us, that we might be made just, and live thereby. Besides these, there is a righteousness, which this person has, as these two natures are joined in one; and this is not the righteousness of the Godhead, as distinguished from the manhood; nor the righteousness of the manhood, as distinguished from the Godhead; but a righteousness which standeth to the union of both natures, and may properly be called the righteousness that is essential to His being prepared of God to the capacity of the mediatory office which he was to be entrusted with. If He parts with His first righteousness, He parts with His Godhead; if He parts

Digitized by Google

with His second righteousness, He parts with the purity of His manhood; if He parts with this third, He parts with that perfection which capacitates Him for the office of mediation. He has, therefore, another righteousness, which standeth in performance, or obedience to a revealed will; and that it is that He puts upon sinners, and that by which their sins are covered. Wherefore He saith, "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." (Rom. v. 19.)

CHRISTIANA.—But are the other righteousnesses of no use to us?

GREAT.—Yes; for though they are essential to His natures and offices, and cannot be communicated unto another; yet it is by virtue of them that the righteousness that justifies is for that purpose efficacious. The righteousness of His Godhead gives virtue to His obedience; the righteousness of His manhood giveth capability to His obedience to justify; and the righteousness that standeth in the union of these two natures to His office, giveth authority to that righteousness to do the work for which it was ordained.

So then here is a righteousness that Christ as God has no need of; for He is God without it. Here is a righteousness that Christ, as man, has no need of to make Him so; for He is per-

Digitized by Google

fect man without it. Again, here is a righteousness that Christ as God-man has no need of; for He is perfectly so without it. Here then is a righteousness that Christ as God, and as God-man, has no need of with reference to Himself, and therefore He can spare it; a justifying righteousness, that He for Himself wanteth not, and therefore giveth it away. Hence it is called the gift of righteousness. (Rom. v. 17.) . . . . . Now our Lord, indeed, hath two coats—one for Himself and one to spare; wherefore He freely bestows one upon those that have none. And thus, Christiana and Mercy, and the rest of you that are here, doth your pardon come by deed, or by the work of another man. Your Lord Christ is He that worked, and hath given away what He wrought for to the next poor beggar He meets.

But, again, in order to pardon by deed, there must something be paid to God as a price, as well as something prepared to cover us withal. Sin has delivered us up to the just curse of a righteous law: now from this curse we must be justified by way of redemption, a price being paid for the harms we have done; and this is by the blood of your Lord, who came and stood in your place instead, and died your death for your transgressions. Thus has He ransomed you from your transgressions by blood, and covered your polluted and deformed souls with righteous-

Digitized by Google

ness (Rom. viii. 34), for the sake of which God passeth by you, and will not hurt you when He comes to judge the world. (Gal. iii. 13.)

CHRISTIANA.—This is brave! Now I see that there was something to be learned by our being pardoned by word and deed.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google